

1                   IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2                   FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
3                   EASTERN DIVISION AT CLEVELAND

4                   -----X  
5           IN RE: : Case No. 1:17-md-2804  
6                   : :  
7           NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION :  
8           OPIATE LITIGATION :  
9                   : **VOLUME 24**  
10           CASE TRACK THREE : JURY TRIAL  
11                   : : (Pages 6194 - 6490)  
12                   : :  
13                   : :  
14                   : :  
15                   : :  
16                   : : November 5, 2021  
17                   -----X

18                   TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL PROCEEDINGS

19                   HELD BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAN AARON POLSTER

20                   SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

21                   Official Court Reporter:       Lance A. Boardman, RDR, CRR  
22   United States District Court  
23   801 West Superior Avenue  
24   Court Reporters 7-189  
25   Cleveland, Ohio 44113  
   216.357.7019

26                   Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript  
27                   produced by computer-aided transcription.

## 1 APPEARANCES:

2 For the Plaintiffs: Peter H. Weinberger, Esq.  
3 SPANGENBERG, SHIBLEY & LIBER  
4 1001 Lakeside Avenue, Ste. 1700  
5 1900 East Ninth Street  
6 Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
7 216-696-3232

8 W. Mark Lanier, Esq.  
9 Rachel Lanier, Esq.  
10 THE LANIER LAW FIRM  
11 6810 FM 1960 West  
12 Houston, Texas 77069  
13 813-659-5200

14 Frank L. Gallucci, III, Esq.  
15 PLEVIN & GALLUCCI COMPANY, LPA  
16 The Illuminating Building  
17 Suite 2222  
18 55 Public Square  
19 Cleveland, Ohio 44113  
20 216-861-0804

21 Salvatore C. Badala, Esq.  
22 Maria Fleming, Esq.  
23 NAPOLI SHKOLNIK  
24 360 Lexington Ave., 11th Floor  
25 New York, New York 10017  
212-397-1000

26  
27  
28 For Walgreens Defendants: Kaspar J. Stoffelmayr, Esq.  
29 Brian C. Swanson, Esq.  
30 Katherine M. Swift, Esq.  
31 BARTLIT BECK LLP  
32 54 West Hubbard Street, Ste. 300  
33 Chicago, Illinois 60654  
34 312-494-4400  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
2510  
2511  
2512  
2513  
2514  
2515  
2516  
2517  
2518  
2519  
2520  
2521  
2522  
2523  
2524  
2525  
2526  
2527  
2528  
2529  
2530  
2531  
2532  
2533  
2534  
2535  
2536  
2537  
2538  
2539  
2540  
2541  
2542  
2543  
2544  
2545  
2546  
2547  
2548  
2549  
2550  
2551  
2552  
2553  
2554  
2555  
2556  
2557  
2558  
2559  
2560  
2561  
2562  
2563  
2564  
2565  
2566  
2567  
2568  
2569  
2570  
2571  
2572  
2573  
2574  
2575  
2576  
2577  
2578  
2579  
2580  
2581  
2582  
2583  
2584  
2585  
2586  
2587  
2588  
2589  
2590  
2591  
2592  
2593  
2594  
2595  
2596  
2597  
2598  
2599  
25100  
25101  
25102  
25103  
25104  
25105  
25106  
25107  
25108  
25109  
25110  
25111  
25112  
25113  
25114  
25115  
25116  
25117  
25118  
25119  
25120  
25121  
25122  
25123  
25124  
25125  
25126  
25127  
25128  
25129  
25130  
25131  
25132  
25133  
25134  
25135  
25136  
25137  
25138  
25139  
25140  
25141  
25142  
25143  
25144  
25145  
25146  
25147  
25148  
25149  
25150  
25151  
25152  
25153  
25154  
25155  
25156  
25157  
25158  
25159  
25160  
25161  
25162  
25163  
25164  
25165  
25166  
25167  
25168  
25169  
25170  
25171  
25172  
25173  
25174  
25175  
25176  
25177  
25178  
25179  
25180  
25181  
25182  
25183  
25184  
25185  
25186  
25187  
25188  
25189  
25190  
25191  
25192  
25193  
25194  
25195  
25196  
25197  
25198  
25199  
25200  
25201  
25202  
25203  
25204  
25205  
25206  
25207  
25208  
25209  
25210  
25211  
25212  
25213  
25214  
25215  
25216  
25217  
25218  
25219  
25220  
25221  
25222  
25223  
25224  
25225  
25226  
25227  
25228  
25229  
25230  
25231  
25232  
25233  
25234  
25235  
25236  
25237  
25238  
25239  
25240  
25241  
25242  
25243  
25244  
25245  
25246  
25247  
25248  
25249  
25250  
25251  
25252  
25253  
25254  
25255  
25256  
25257  
25258  
25259  
25260  
25261  
25262  
25263  
25264  
25265  
25266  
25267  
25268  
25269  
25270  
25271  
25272  
25273  
25274  
25275  
25276  
25277  
25278  
25279  
25280  
25281  
25282  
25283  
25284  
25285  
25286  
25287  
25288  
25289  
25290  
25291  
25292  
25293  
25294  
25295  
25296  
25297  
25298  
25299  
25300  
25301  
25302  
25303  
25304  
25305  
25306  
25307  
25308  
25309  
25310  
25311  
25312  
25313  
25314  
25315  
25316  
25317  
25318  
25319  
25320  
25321  
25322  
25323  
25324  
25325  
25326  
25327  
25328  
25329  
25330  
25331  
25332  
25333  
25334  
25335  
25336  
25337  
25338  
25339  
25340  
25341  
25342  
25343  
25344  
25345  
25346  
25347  
25348  
25349  
25350  
25351  
25352  
25353  
25354  
25355  
25356  
25357  
25358  
25359  
25360  
25361  
25362  
25363  
25364  
25365  
25366  
25367  
25368  
25369  
25370  
25371  
25372  
25373  
25374  
25375  
25376  
25377  
25378  
25379  
25380  
25381  
25382  
25383  
25384  
25385  
25386  
25387  
25388  
25389  
25390  
25391  
25392  
25393  
25394  
25395  
25396  
25397  
25398  
25399  
25400  
25401  
25402  
25403  
25404  
25405  
25406  
25407  
25408  
25409  
25410  
25411  
25412  
25413  
25414  
25415  
25416  
25417  
25418  
25419  
25420  
25421  
25422  
25423  
25424  
25425  
25426  
25427  
25428  
25429  
25430  
25431  
25432  
25433  
25434  
25435  
25436  
25437  
25438  
25439  
25440  
25441  
25442  
25443  
25444  
25445  
25446  
25447  
25448  
25449  
25450  
25451  
25452  
25453  
25454  
25455  
25456  
25457  
25458  
25459  
25460  
25461  
25462  
25463  
25464  
25465  
25466  
25467  
25468  
25469  
25470  
25471  
25472  
25473  
25474  
25475  
25476  
25477  
25478  
25479  
25480  
25481  
25482  
25483  
25484  
25485  
25486  
25487  
25488  
25489  
25490  
25491  
25492  
25493  
25494  
25495  
25496  
25497  
25498  
25499  
25500  
25501  
25502  
25503  
25504  
25505  
25506  
25507  
25508  
25509  
25510  
25511  
25512  
25513  
25514  
25515  
25516  
25517  
25518  
25519  
25520  
25521  
25522  
25523  
25524  
25525  
25526  
25527  
25528  
25529  
25530  
25531  
25532  
25533  
25534  
25535  
25536  
25537  
25538  
25539  
25540  
25541  
25542  
25543  
25544  
25545  
25546  
25547  
25548  
25549  
25550  
25551  
25552  
25553  
25554  
25555  
25556  
25557  
25558  
25559  
25560  
25561  
25562  
25563  
25564  
25565  
25566  
25567  
25568  
25569  
25570  
25571  
25572  
25573  
25574  
25575  
25576  
25577  
25578  
25579  
25580  
25581  
25582  
25583  
25584  
25585  
25586  
25587  
25588  
25589  
25590  
25591  
25592  
25593  
25594  
25595  
25596  
25597  
25598  
25599  
25600  
25601  
25602  
25603  
25604  
25605  
25606  
25607  
25608  
25609  
25610  
25611  
25612  
25613  
25614  
25615  
25616  
25617  
25618  
25619  
25620  
25621  
25622  
25623  
25624  
25625  
25626  
25627  
25628  
25629  
25630  
25631  
25632  
25633  
25634  
25635  
25636  
25637  
25638  
25639  
25640  
25641  
25642  
25643  
25644  
25645  
25646  
25647  
25648  
25649  
25650  
25651  
25652  
25653  
25654  
25655  
25656  
25657  
25658  
25659  
25660  
25661  
25662  
25663  
25664  
25665  
25666  
25667  
25668  
25669  
25670  
25671  
25672  
25673  
25674  
25675  
25676  
25677  
25678  
25679  
25680  
25681  
25682  
25683  
25684  
25685  
25686  
25687  
25688  
25689  
25690  
25691  
25692  
25693  
25694  
25695  
25696  
25697  
25698  
25699  
25700  
25701  
25702  
25703  
25704  
25705  
25706  
25707  
25708  
25709  
25710  
25711  
25712  
25713  
25714  
25715  
25716  
25717  
25718  
25719  
25720  
25721  
25722  
25723  
25724  
25725  
25726  
25727  
25728  
25729  
25730  
25731  
25732  
25733  
25734  
25735  
25736  
25737  
25738  
25739  
25740  
25741  
25742  
25743  
25744  
25745  
25746  
25747  
25748  
25749  
25750  
25751  
25752  
25753  
25754  
25755  
25756  
25757  
25758  
25759  
25760  
25761  
25762  
25763  
25764  
25765  
25766  
25767  
25768  
25769  
25770  
25771  
25772  
25773  
25774  
25775  
25776  
25777  
25778  
25779  
25780  
25781  
25782  
25783  
25784  
25785  
25786  
25787  
25788  
25789  
25790  
25791  
25792  
25793  
25794  
25795  
25796  
25797  
25798  
25799  
25800  
25801  
25802  
25803  
25804  
25805  
25806  
25807  
25808  
25809  
25810  
25811  
25812  
25813  
25814  
25815  
25816  
25817  
25818  
25819  
25820  
25821  
25822  
25823  
25824  
25825  
25826  
25827  
25828  
25829  
25830  
25831  
25832  
25833  
25834  
25835  
25836  
25837  
25838  
25839  
25840  
25841  
25842  
25843  
25844  
25845  
25846  
25847  
25848  
25849  
25850  
25851  
25852  
25853  
25854  
25855  
25856  
25857  
25858  
25859  
25860  
25861  
25862  
25863  
25864  
25865  
25866  
25867  
25868  
25869  
25870  
25871  
25872  
25873  
25874  
25875  
25876  
25877  
25878  
25879  
25880  
25881  
25882  
25883  
25884  
25885  
25886  
25887  
25888  
25889  
25890  
25891  
25892  
25893  
25894  
25895  
25896  
25897  
25898  
25899  
25900  
25901  
25902  
25903  
25904  
25905  
25906  
25907  
25908  
25909  
25910  
25911  
25912  
25913  
25914  
25915  
25916  
25917  
25918  
25919  
25920  
25921  
25922  
25923  
25924  
25925  
25926  
25927  
25928  
25929  
25930  
25931  
25932  
25933  
25934  
25935  
25936  
25937  
25938  
25939  
25940  
25941  
25942  
25943  
25944  
25945  
25946  
25947  
25948  
25949  
25950  
25951  
25952  
25953  
25954  
25955  
25956  
25957  
25958  
25959  
25960  
25961  
25962  
25963  
25964  
25965  
25966  
25967  
25968  
25969  
25970  
25971  
25972  
25973  
25974  
25975  
25976  
25977  
25978  
25979  
25980  
25981  
25982  
25983  
25984  
25985  
25986  
25987  
25988  
25989  
25990  
25991  
25992  
25993  
25994  
25995  
25996  
25997  
25998  
25999  
25100  
25101  
25102  
25103  
25104  
25105  
25106  
25107  
25108  
25109  
25110  
25111  
25112  
25113  
25114  
25115  
25116  
25117  
25118  
25119  
25120  
25121  
25122  
25123  
25124  
25125  
25126  
25127  
25128  
25129  
25130  
25131  
25132  
25133  
25134  
25135  
25136  
25137  
25138  
25139  
25140  
25141  
25142  
25143  
25144  
25145  
25146  
25147  
25148  
25149  
25150  
25151  
25152  
25153  
25154  
25155  
25156  
25157  
25158  
25159  
25160  
25161  
25162  
25163  
25164  
25165  
25166  
25167  
25168  
25169  
25170  
25171  
25172  
25173  
25174  
25175  
25176  
25177  
25178  
25179  
25180  
25181  
25182  
25183  
25184  
25185  
25186  
25187  
25188  
25189  
25190  
25191  
25192  
25193  
25194  
25195  
25196  
25197  
25198  
25199  
25200  
25201  
25202  
25203  
25204  
25205  
25206  
25207  
25208  
25209  
25210  
25211  
25212  
25213  
25214  
25215  
25216  
25217  
25218  
25219  
25220  
25221  
25222  
25223  
25224  
25225  
25226  
25227  
25228  
25229  
25230  
25231  
25232  
25233  
25234  
25235  
25236  
25237  
25238  
25239  
25240  
25241  
25242  
25243  
25244  
25245  
25246  
25247  
25248  
25249  
25250  
25251  
25252  
25253  
25254  
25255  
25256  
25257  
25258  
25259  
25260  
25261  
25262  
25263  
25264  
25265  
25266  
25267  
25268  
25269  
25270  
25271  
25272  
25273  
25274  
25275  
25276  
25277  
25278  
25279  
25280  
25281  
25282  
25283  
25284  
25285  
25286  
25287  
25288  
25289  
25290  
25291  
25292  
25293  
25294  
25295  
25296  
25297  
25298  
25299  
25300  
25301  
25302  
25303  
25304  
25305  
25306  
25307  
25308  
25309  
25310  
25311  
25312  
25313  
25314  
25315  
25316  
25317  
25318  
25319  
25320  
25321  
25322  
25323  
25324  
25325  
25326  
25327  
25328  
25329  
25330  
25331  
25332  
25333  
25334  
25335  
25336  
25337  
25338  
25339  
25340  
25341  
25342  
25343  
25344  
25345  
25346  
25347  
25348  
25349  
25350  
25351  
25352  
25353  
25354  
25355  
25356  
25357  
25358  
25359  
25360  
25361  
25362  
25363  
25364  
25365  
25366  
25367  
25368  
25369  
25370  
25371  
25372  
25373  
25374  
25375  
25376  
25377  
25378  
25379  
25380  
25381  
25382  
25383  
25384  
25385  
25386  
25387  
25388  
25389  
25390  
25391  
25392  
25393  
25394  
25395  
25396  
25397  
25398  
25399  
25400  
25401  
25402  
25403  
25404  
25405  
25406  
25407  
25408  
25409  
25410  
25411  
25412  
25413  
25414  
25415  
25416  
25417  
25418  
25419  
25420  
25421  
25422  
25423  
25424  
25425  
25426  
25427  
25428  
25429  
25430  
25431  
25432  
25433  
25434  
25435  
25436  
25437  
25438  
25439  
25440  
25441  
25442  
25443  
25444  
25445  
25446  
25447  
25448  
25449  
25450  
25451  
25452  
25453  
25454  
25455  
25456  
25457  
25458  
25459  
25460  
25461  
25462  
25463  
25464  
25465  
25466  
25467  
25468  
25469  
25470  
25471  
25472  
25473  
25474  
25475  
25476  
25477  
25478  
25479  
25480  
25481  
25482  
25483  
25484  
25485  
25486  
25487  
25488  
25489  
25490  
2

1 APPEARANCES (Cont'd) :

2 For CVS Defendants: Graeme W. Bush, Esq.  
3 Eric R. Delinsky, Esq.  
4 Kyle A. Crawford, Esq.  
ZUCKERMAN SPAEDER - WASHINGTON  
Suite 1000  
1800 M Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
202-778-1831

6

7

For Walmart Defendants: John M. Majoras, Esq.  
JONES DAY - COLUMBUS  
Suite 600  
325 John H. McConnell Blvd.  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-281-3835

11

12

13

14

Tara A. Fumerton, Esq.  
Tina M. Tabacchi, Esq.  
JONES DAY - CHICAGO  
Suite 3500  
77 West Wacker  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
312-782-3939

15

16

ALSO PRESENT: David Cohen, Special Master

17 - - - - -

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1                   Table of Contents

2		
3	<u>Witnesses/Events</u>	<u>Page</u>
4	MARK GLICKMAN	6214
5	Ms. Fumerton - Direct	6214
6	Mr. Lanier - Cross	6285
7	Ms. Fumerton - Redirect	6325
8	Mr. Lanier - Recross	6343
9	ROBERT HILL	6352
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 (In open court at 8:47 a.m.)

2 THE COURT: We can take up the exhibits for  
3 Dr. Murphy and Dr. Choi.

It looks like the plaintiffs are offering two.

5 Any objection to either of these two?

6 Looks like the plaintiffs are offering two exhibits  
7 with Dr. Murphy, 0166, the Case and Deaton article, and  
8 17422, an e-mail.

9 Any objection to either of those?

10 MS. FUMERTON: So, Your Honor, we had just  
11 exchanged exhibits last night. I apologize, I was just with  
12 the next witness. Will we have till lunch just to make sure  
13 we're on the same page?

14 THE COURT: All right. I don't have any from  
15 the defendants.

MS. FUMERTON: Yeah, I have a list for you.

20 MR. WEINBERGER: That's correct.

21 THE COURT: That's correct? All right. I can  
22 read these into the record then.

23           03882A, 03886A, 03887A, 03896A, 04311A, 04313A,  
24       04313B, 04320A, 04328A, 04335A, 04337A, 04339, 04340, 04341,  
25       04342A, 04343A, 04346A, 04352A, 04363A, 04966, 04967, 04968,

1 all without objection.

2 Do plaintiffs have any for Dr. Choi?

3 MR. BUSH: Just to be perfectly clear, the  
4 prefix for that should be CVS-MDL. I don't think you said  
5 all that.

6 THE COURT: I don't know how these are all --  
7 all right, if the prefix are on there or not.

8 MR. BUSH: They are.

9 THE COURT: All right. These are all CVS-MDL  
10 then.

11 Do the plaintiffs have anything for Dr. Choi?

12 MR. WEINBERGER: No, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Okay. Fine. Then we'll take up  
14 Dr. Murphy later.

15 MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, I'm not sure  
16 where the record stands on this one from Harrington, which  
17 was P-08415. My recollection is we had discussion about it  
18 and that you were going to still consider it. This is  
19 the --

20 THE COURT: Let me have the exhibit.

21 MR. WEINBERGER: 08415, Robert.

22 MS. FLEMING: You have it from yesterday,  
23 Robert.

24 THE COURT: I thought I made a ruling on this.  
25 Robert, what ruling was made on 08451?

1 I wrote that it was withdrawn.

2 MR. WEINBERGER: No, we didn't withdraw it.

3 THE COURT: Well, that's what -- you said you  
4 weren't offering it then, so it was withdrawn.

5 MR. WEINBERGER: No, this was -- the objection  
6 was that she didn't recognize it, but it was on -- but her  
7 name is on it.

8 THE COURT: All right. I wrote down that it  
9 was withdrawn.

10 So you are offering it?

11 MR. WEINBERGER: Yes. And slides -- or pages  
12 27, 28 to 35, has her name on it as for Professional  
13 Practices.

14 THE COURT: Refusals to fill, are those the  
15 pages you're offering?

16 MR. WEINBERGER: I think it has to be in the  
17 context of the entire PowerPoint, but I'm just pointing out  
18 those pages because she's referenced there.

19 THE COURT: I'm looking at page 27. I don't  
20 see --

21 MR. WEINBERGER: Slide 27, 28 to 35.

22 THE COURT: All I have is page numbers, so I  
23 don't -- all right.

24 Where is the witness mentioned?

25 MS. FLEMING: Slide 27 of --

1                   THE COURT: Slide 27 doesn't mean anything to  
2 me. All I have is page numbers here.

3                   MR. LANIER: Your Honor, if you'll hand it to  
4 me, I'll find it.

5                   THE COURT: All right.

6                   MR. LANIER: Your Honor, we're on Bates number  
7 ending in 204. You'll see her name --

8                   THE COURT: Well, her name's on it, so...

9                   Well, it seems to me the portion of the document with  
10 her name on it should come in, whether she recognized it or  
11 not, because her name's on it, and she -- you know, she  
12 didn't disavow it. She didn't say someone put it on in an  
13 unauthorized way.

14                  I can't remember what she said about it, but --

15                  MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, I don't believe she  
16 provided testimony about that portion of the deck.

17                  THE COURT: If someone can pull out the  
18 testimony for me. As I said, I thought the plaintiffs had  
19 withdrawn this yesterday, so I moved on.

20                  MR. LANIER: The testimony was about -- Your  
21 Honor, I'm sorry, if I could borrow your document again.  
22 This should not happen this way. I apologize. You've been  
23 very patient, and I thank you for that.

24                  The part that I questioned her about was about the  
25 holy trinity alert on page 208, that it still wasn't working

1 as of that point in time and that it was a project to be  
2 done.

3 THE COURT: Right, that I remember. She was  
4 questioned on page 208.

5 Well, that page should come in.

6 I don't know, Mr. Lanier, if she was questioned about  
7 these other pages that have her name on it.

8 MR. LANIER: I did not, Your Honor, and so  
9 it's fine for me if that's the only page that comes in.  
10 It's less distracting that way. We can put in the page  
11 number.

12 THE COURT: It seems to me this one page  
13 should come in because she gave testimony about it.

14 So without objection then, CVS-MDL-T380208, so it's  
15 one page only. It happens also to say -- it doesn't have --  
16 it has page number 29 on the document, so that one page  
17 comes in.

18 MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, we would just  
19 propose that the cover e-mail be included, too, to get some  
20 framing.

21 THE COURT: All right.

22 MR. DELINSKY: 084150001.

23 THE COURT: All right. Without objection, the  
24 cover e-mail can come in. That's a good idea.

25 So I guess by the end of the day I'll get whatever

1 submissions on the jury instructions people want to make.  
2 My team and I will obviously carefully consider them, and if  
3 there's any -- I don't know if you've conferred and agreed  
4 on anything. There hasn't been much agreement on jury  
5 instructions, so --

6 MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, I can tell you  
7 that with respect to the jury instructions that were  
8 submitted I think by Special Master Cohen on the 1st, the  
9 most updated, plaintiffs have no objection to.

10 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Weinberger.

11 MR. STOFFELMAYR: Kaspar Stoffelmayr. I think  
12 we're still working together on this. Defendants may  
13 have --

14 (Audio feedback.)

15 MR. STOFFELMAYR: I'm sorry.

16 THE COURT: Your metallic head or something?

17 MR. STOFFELMAYR: I'm magnetic or something,  
18 yeah.

19 I think defendants may have some very, very limited  
20 targeted suggestions that we'll get to you by 4 p.m.

21 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I will look at  
22 anything you submit carefully.

23 MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, can we just go back  
24 to that exhibit?

25 MR. WEINBERGER: You want the whole thing, is

1 it?

2 MR. DELINSKY: No, but here's the problem,  
3 Your Honor, is that what Ms. Harrington talked about was the  
4 development of the new alert for the combination, okay? And  
5 whether -- I think what Mr. Lanier asked her about, was the  
6 prior DUR alert adequate or inadequate given that CVS was  
7 trying to pioneer and in fact did pioneer this new alert.

8 There's numbers at the bottom which were not the  
9 subject of any testimony, and there's no explanation for  
10 them. And there's a potential for prejudice due to the lack  
11 of explanation for what those are, and they can be  
12 misconstrued.

13 THE COURT: On that one page -- Mr. Pitts, let  
14 me see the one page.

15 MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, there was just no  
16 questioning or testimony about those numbers.

17 MR. WEINBERGER: Eric, can I see that?

18 THE COURT: That's true, the testimony was  
19 about, you know, holy trinity alert. We didn't go into  
20 the --

21 MR. DELINSKY: So we just ask those be  
22 redacted, Your Honor.

23 MR. WEINBERGER: We don't have a problem with  
24 that.

25 THE COURT: All right. Fine. We'll redact

1                   the tables with the numbers at the bottom.

2                   MR. DELINSKY: We'll work with Pete and Maria  
3 to get that done.

4                   Thank you, Your Honor.

5                   THE COURT: Okay.

6                   MR. MAJORAS: Your Honor?

7                   THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Majoras.

8                   MR. MAJORAS: Thank you, sir. Just an update  
9 again on what we're looking at going forward, we talked  
10 about it yesterday morning.

11                  So we have Dr. Glickman and Mr. Hill today. We think  
12 we'll also have some very short depositions before the end  
13 of the day.

14                  THE COURT: Okay.

15                  MR. MAJORAS: We have the three pharmacist  
16 witnesses that will be next week. Plaintiffs I'm sure know  
17 this already, but I can disclose from Walmart's standpoint  
18 it will be Lori Militello from our standpoint.

19                  The one change from what I talked about yesterday, now  
20 that we know it looks like we'll go into Tuesday, and from  
21 events yesterday, we may call one additional expert. It's  
22 Daniel Kessler. He's been previously disclosed and deposed.

23                  We have disclosure obligations this evening, but we  
24 will try to keep plaintiffs apprised as soon as we can on  
25 the certainty of that.

1                   THE COURT: That's not -- that's a different  
2 Kessler from the Government official, right?

3                   MR. MAJORAS: Yes, sir. That was David  
4 Kessler.

5                   THE COURT: What's his expertise?

6                   MR. MAJORAS: Mr. Kessler will talk about  
7 causation issues. We think it will be relatively short.  
8 Obviously we have to watch our time, but that is one change  
9 from yesterday.

10                  THE COURT: All right. So you think you'll  
11 get through the two experts and the depositions today?

12                  MR. MAJORAS: I'm optimistic. It will be done  
13 in my absence, Your Honor, so I'm sure everyone will move  
14 quickly.

15                  MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, I think the key to  
16 that rests with Mr. Weinberger and Mr. Lanier.

17                  MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, I believe they're  
18 probably talking about one of the depositions to be played  
19 is Deborah Mack, and I hate to keep coming back to the well  
20 on Deborah Mack's deposition.

21                  I sent an e-mail yesterday to Special Master Cohen.

22                  To give some context, Deborah Mack was the supervisor  
23 of Mr. Nelson. She was -- we were permitted to depose her  
24 as part of the sanction motion that arose after Susanne  
25 Hiland's deposition. It was a discovery deposition.

1           They now want to play this deposition even though they  
2 haven't demonstrated that she's unavailable. So, and you've  
3 said that she can and that if we want to we can call her by  
4 videoconferencing.

5           But that doesn't cure our concern about 80 percent of  
6 her testimony, which is hearsay testimony about  
7 conversations that she had or that someone else had that  
8 they told her about.

9           THE COURT: I'm not going to let her talk  
10 about conversations that someone else had. If she talked --  
11 if she spoke to a Government official, she can relate that  
12 on such-and-such a date or approximately such-and-such a  
13 date I spoke to so-and-so from the State Board of Pharmacy,  
14 and as -- I mean, I don't think she can relate the detail,  
15 the exact words, but she can say, as a result of that, I did  
16 X, Y, and Z or I didn't do X, Y, and Z. That's not hearsay.

17           MR. WEINBERGER: That's the problem, Your  
18 Honor, with this deposition, because the guardrails were not  
19 there at the time of the deposition, and embedded within  
20 answers are specific information that she gleaned as a  
21 result of those conversations or that -- or specific  
22 information about those conversations.

23           She then did go on to say that she, you know, created  
24 policies as a result of that. But since she's not  
25 testifying live in court, you know, we can't attack those --

1                   THE COURT: Well, understood. But, you know,  
2 I can't -- then bring her -- you know, if you want to bring  
3 her in next week, bring her in, and you can cross-examine  
4 her.

5                   MR. WEINBERGER: I don't want to bring her in  
6 at all, but I don't want this deposition to be played that  
7 has, you know, this prejudicial hearsay that's embedded in  
8 it.

9                   THE COURT: Well, we've already had testimony  
10 that various people talked to people at the Ohio Board of  
11 Pharmacy, and they had certain impressions and did certain  
12 things.

13                  MR. WEINBERGER: Not the Ohio Board, Your  
14 Honor. Other boards of pharmacy.

15                  MR. MAJORAS: It's a national policy, Your  
16 Honor. Plaintiffs spent I don't know how many hours now  
17 talking to Mr. Nelson about the national policies and why  
18 Walmart had them. This has been ruled on many times  
19 already.

20                  THE COURT: Ms. Mack talked to someone at the  
21 Ohio Board of Pharmacy?

22                  MR. WEINBERGER: She didn't, not the Ohio  
23 Board, Your Honor. There's no testimony about that. That's  
24 what's so prejudicial about this, that they are seeking to  
25 admit into evidence conversations that she had with Texas

1 and with Oregon. She can't --

2 THE COURT: I've allowed that kind of  
3 testimony.

4 MR. WEINBERGER: But this is information about  
5 what they said to her.

6 MR. MAJORAS: She's not testifying about what  
7 they said, Your Honor. These are all questions that the  
8 plaintiffs asked and she's responded to. It's been ruled  
9 on.

10 THE COURT: I've looked at them and I've made  
11 my rulings.

12 MR. WEINBERGER: Then, Your Honor, I think the  
13 only way for us to respond to this is that we're going to  
14 recall Carmen Catizone to the stand in rebuttal.

15 THE COURT: That's fine. The point is that  
16 Walmart has, you know, a couple of witnesses have said that  
17 they spoke to people at various state board of pharmacies,  
18 and as a result of those conversations, they did or didn't  
19 do certain things. They're allowed -- I mean --

20 MR. WEINBERGER: But that's not -- you know,  
21 Your Honor, reading carefully this deposition, in these  
22 answers about how we changed our policy is rank hearsay  
23 about what somebody said, somebody from the Board of  
24 Pharmacy said to either her or to somebody else at Walmart  
25 that got related to her.

1                   THE COURT: I'm not going to -- I'm not going  
2 to allow her to talk about what someone else at Walmart  
3 related to her. I believe we've excised that.

4                   MR. WEINBERGER: But even what somebody at the  
5 Board of Pharmacy specifically said to her is rank hearsay.

6                   MR. MAJORAS: It is not in this case. It's  
7 why we have the policies we had, Your Honor.

8                   THE COURT: Mr. Weinberger, it may not be  
9 hearsay. It's not necessarily being offered for the truth  
10 of the matter, but the fact it was said.

11                  MR. MAJORAS: That's absolutely right, Your  
12 Honor.

13                  MR. WEINBERGER: How is it not being offered  
14 for the truth of the matter?

15                  MR. MAJORAS: It shows why we have the  
16 policies that they're attacking, Your Honor.

17                  THE COURT: Maybe the conversation happened,  
18 maybe it didn't. Maybe the person said it or not. But this  
19 witness is saying on such-and-such a day I spoke to someone  
20 at the State Board of Pharmacy.

21                  MR. WEINBERGER: Right, and they said X, Y,  
22 and Z.

23                  THE COURT: Right.

24                  MR. MAJORAS: And that's what motivated the  
25 policy.

1                   THE COURT: All right. It's not being used  
2 for the truth of the matter asserted. She relied on it. I  
3 mean, she thought it was authentic, and she's entitled to  
4 rely on it. All right? It's a state official, okay?

5                   MR. WEINBERGER: Well, then we're going to  
6 need a limiting instruction, Your Honor, that, you know,  
7 specifically says --

8                   THE COURT: All right, if you want to, get me  
9 a limiting instruction. That's why I've allowed this  
10 testimony, because, you know, if someone talks to DEA or  
11 someone talks to the Ohio Board of Pharmacy and they give  
12 you instructions, the same way -- it's like a letter from  
13 Mr. Rannazzisi. You know, you're entitled to rely on that.  
14 He's an authority for DEA.

15                  So you get a letter from him and it says do this or  
16 don't do that. All right? Whether he really said it or  
17 not, quite frankly, it doesn't matter. If the recipient  
18 thinks it's authentic, then it comes in. The same way with  
19 this conversation. Maybe it happened, maybe it didn't,  
20 maybe she's not telling the truth. I don't know.

21                  MR. WEINBERGER: Okay. Other than the one  
22 document from Wisconsin, there is no --

23                  THE COURT: Well --

24                  MR. WEINBERGER: -- it's like the Rannazzisi  
25 letter, Your Honor. There's no documentation about it.

1                   MR. MAJORAS: That's an argument, Your Honor,  
2 That's not a reason not to allow the testimony.

3                   MR. WEINBERGER: It's a 403 issue of  
4 unreliability.

5                   THE COURT: You can cross-examine her, you can  
6 bring the person in, okay. The other people were  
7 cross-examined about it.

8                   The point is it comes in because for the nonhearsay  
9 purpose that Walmart had these conversations, and they acted  
10 in reliance on them.

11                  MR. WEINBERGER: All right. Well, before -- I  
12 understand your ruling, Your Honor. And before this -- if  
13 this deposition is intended to be played today, we're going  
14 to have to seek a limiting instruction that you give either  
15 before or immediately after the testimony.

16                  THE COURT: Well, why don't you work with the  
17 defendants and see what you can propose. Again, the reason  
18 I'm allowing this in is really for the nonhearsay purpose  
19 that the conversation took place; at least the Walmart  
20 witnesses say that it did.

21                  MR. MAJORAS: Thank you, Your Honor.

22                  THE COURT: All right. Okay. Let's bring the  
23 jury in, then.

24                  (The jury is present at 9:10 a.m.)

25                  THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and

1 gentlemen. Please be seated. And I understand one of our  
2 jurors has a birthday, so happy birthday. Sorry, you know,  
3 you didn't get the day off for your birthday.

4 MR. LANIER: Your Honor, will you lead us all  
5 in a round of Happy Birthday?

6 THE COURT: You go. You're a better singer.

7 Congratulations.

8 Okay, Ms. Fumerton, you may call your next witness,  
9 please.

10 MS. FUMERTON: Thank you, Your Honor. Walmart  
11 calls Dr. Mark Glickman, who is an expert in statistics, to  
12 the stand.

13 (Witness sworn.)

14 THE COURT: You may be seated. And you may  
15 take your mask off while testifying.

16 You may proceed, Ms. Fumerton.

17 MS. FUMERTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

18 Dr. Glickman, is everything up there about the right  
19 height? Sort of?

20 THE WITNESS: Close enough.

21 THE COURT: We can't adjust that, that's the  
22 problem.

23 MS. FUMERTON: If you ever have a hard time  
24 hearing me, or if the jury can let us know if they have a  
25 hard time hearing you.

1 MARK GLICKMAN

2 - - - - -

3 DIRECT EXAMINATION

4 BY MS. FUMERTON:

5 **Q** Good morning, Dr. Glickman.

6 **A** Good morning.

7 MS. FUMERTON: Good morning, ladies and  
8 gentlemen of the jury.

9 **Q** I want to get a few things out off the bat.

10 You are not a medical doctor?

11 **A** I am not a medical doctor, no.

12 **Q** Are you a pharmacist?

13 **A** I am not a pharmacist.

14 **Q** Are you an epidemiologist?

15 **A** I'm not an epidemiologist.

16 **Q** Are you an economist?

17 **A** I'm not an economist.

18 **Q** Okay. So why don't you please introduce yourself to  
19 the jury and tell them a little bit about who you are.

20 **A** I'm Mark Glickman, a senior lecturer of statistics at  
21 Harvard University. I'm also simultaneously a senior  
22 statistician at the Center for Health Care Organization and  
23 Implementation Research, which is a VA Center of Innovation.  
24 And that's headquartered in Bedford, Massachusetts, pretty  
25 close to where I work at Harvard.

1       **Q**     And what is the VA?

2       **A**     The VA is the Veterans Administration.

3       **Q**     And generally speaking, why are you here?

4       **A**     I'm here because I was responding to some reports that  
5     were produced by Dr. McCann and some of the other  
6     plaintiffs' experts. I ended up producing two reports, and  
7     I've been doing some work, computational work that I'm going  
8     to be talking about today.

9       **Q**     Did you also review Walmart's dispensing data as it  
10    was reviewed by Dr. McCann?

11      **A**     I did, yes.

12      **Q**     Did you submit any expert reports in this case?

13      **A**     I did submit expert reports.

14      **Q**     How many?

15      **A**     Two.

16      **Q**     Did you sit for a deposition?

17      **A**     Excuse me?

18      **Q**     Did you sit for a disposition?

19      **A**     I did sit for a deposition.

20      **Q**     And with respect to the expert reports you just  
21     mentioned, did anybody assist you with those?

22      **A**     I did receive some assistance, yes.

23      **Q**     From who?

24      **A**     I received assistance from Cornerstone Research.

25      **Q**     And who is Cornerstone?

1       **A**      Cornerstone Research is a firm that I think tends to  
2      assist experts and counsels to do analyses.

3       **Q**      And were the data sets that you were using very large?

4       **A**      They were enormous. They initially practically broke  
5      my computer when I tried to load them.

6       **Q**      Did Cornerstone sort of help with the enormity of that  
7      data set?

8       **A**      They sure did, yes.

9       **Q**      With respect to the expert reports you offered in this  
10     case, were all the opinions offered in those reports yours?

11      **A**      They were mine, yes.

12      **Q**      And are all of the opinions that you are offering  
13     today also yours?

14      **A**      Yes.

15      **Q**      Before we get to those opinions, I want the jury to  
16     learn a little bit more about you, and so I think we're just  
17     going to walk through your resume.

18                  MS. FUMERTON: Mr. Pitts, could I please have  
19     the ELMO.

20      **Q**      And Dr. Glickman, this should be in Tab 1 of your  
21     binder.

22                  MS. FUMERTON: That's true for Plaintiffs and  
23     Your Honor, if you would like to follow along as well.

24      **Q**      Mark Glickman, that's you; is that right?

25      **A**      That's me. There's my phone number.

1       **Q**       Oh. Well, hopefully the jury won't be calling you  
2       after this. Just ignore that part of it.

3                   So we have your office address and Harvard University.

4                   Can you explain why that is?

5       **A**       Because I work there. So, yeah, that's the address of  
6       the Statistics Department at Harvard University where I'm a  
7       senior lecturer on statistics.

8       **Q**       And how long have you been with Harvard?

9       **A**       So I've been at Harvard as a full-time employee as a  
10      senior lecturer since the beginning of 2016, and I was there  
11      as a visitor off and on since 2006.

12      **Q**       I want to ask you a little more about your education.  
13      Could you please explain that to the jury?

14      **A**       So I received my bachelor's in statistics *Summa Cum*  
15      *Laude* from Princeton University in 1986. I subsequently got  
16      my master's degree in statistics from Harvard University in  
17      1989, and then I got my Ph.D. in statistics from Harvard in  
18      1993. So hopefully you see the theme there.

19      **Q**       And you just mentioned your position at Harvard, but  
20      let's talk a little bit about your other academic  
21      appointments, if we can see these here.

22                   Can you just generally sort of hit the highlights for  
23      us?

24      **A**       Yeah. So I basically spent a good part of my career  
25      at Boston University. That's where I started. I was in the

1 Math and Statistics Department for seven years.

2 And then I moved over to the Department of Health  
3 Policy and Management, where I was a professor there from,  
4 what was it, 2004 until 2015, at which point I moved over to  
5 Harvard.

6 I was also a postdoctoral fellow at Harvard Medical  
7 School for one and a half years. That was following my  
8 Ph.D.

9 And then also, as I mentioned earlier, I am a senior  
10 statistician at the Center for Healthcare Organization and  
11 Implementation Research, where I work on grant-funded --  
12 VA-funded grants that are designed to improve healthcare for  
13 veterans.

14 **Q** I want to talk about those grants and your work as an  
15 investigator in a minute, but just one follow-up question.

16 So what does a statistician do at Harvard Medical  
17 School? I'm specifically asking about a little more  
18 information on this postdoctoral fellow.

19 **A** So the Department of Healthcare Policy at Harvard  
20 Medical School is an interdisciplinary department, so it has  
21 health economists, it has doctors, it has sociologists, it  
22 has people like me, statisticians. And we all collaborate  
23 on projects together with the aim of, you know,  
24 understanding public health and improving public health.

25 So you need all those pieces together in order to form

1       these projects that are likely to produce innovation and  
2       novelty in healthcare delivery.

3       **Q**       And moving down, I want to talk a little bit about  
4       your major research interests. And if you could just  
5       explain sort of what it is that you have listed here.

6       **A**       Sure. So the first area, which is called Bayesian  
7       inference, is a particular framework for analyzing data.  
8       The world's -- most statisticians are not aware of this, but  
9       the world splits into roughly equal parts. There are  
10      classical statisticians and then there are people like me  
11      who are Bayesian statisticians.

12           The way we tend to perform our data analyses is  
13       slightly different from the classical statisticians, but it  
14       all hinges on the definition of probability. But that's an  
15       area that I've done some methodological work.

16           The pair comparisons work, pair comparison models and  
17       design, basically stems from my interest in chess, so I got  
18       into statistics through my interest in the game chess.

19           I was a tournament player when I was very young, and  
20       the one thing I was really interested in is how they  
21       numerically come up with ability estimates of chess players.  
22       So like when you play in a tournament, you end up earning a  
23       chess rating. And if like you and I have chess ratings, we  
24       should be able to figure out what's the probability that one  
25       of us defeats the other.

1           And so I was always interested in that, and that's how  
2 I got into statistics.

3           And fast-forward, you know, 20 years later, I've  
4 actually written a lot of papers in that area, in being able  
5 to come up with better ways to estimate players' abilities  
6 based on team outcomes in chess.

7   **Q**       And how about this Applications to Health Services and  
8 Medicine?

9   **A**       All right. So also a lot of the work that I end up  
10 doing is applications to health services, and a lot of it  
11 has been for veterans, you know, healthcare for veterans.

12          So I have a number of applications of work in health  
13 applications, so just as a couple examples, I've done some  
14 work in what's called genetic epidemiology, which is  
15 essentially being able to figure out how certain genes are  
16 going to influence health outcomes later.

17          And so one of the kinds of problems I worked on early  
18 on was how to take certain what are called genotypes,  
19 particular mutations of genes, and figure out what their  
20 impact is going to be in developing breast cancer. So that  
21 was one project I did early on.

22          I've also been interested in racial disparities in  
23 delivery of healthcare. So it's actually pretty well known  
24 that in healthcare that blacks are -- tend to be -- have  
25 worse healthcare outcomes, particularly for hypertension,

1 than whites do. And that's something that we've done a lot  
2 of work in trying to dig in and understand what's the reason  
3 for that, because it may not just simply be genetic, it may  
4 end up being because providers aren't providing the best  
5 care for their black patients compared to how they deliver  
6 care for white patients. And that's something that we've  
7 been exploring.

8 **Q** I'm going to stop you there just because actually you  
9 have a ton of interesting things to talk about. We're going  
10 to talk about some more of them as well.

11 Let's talk about the grants work that you did, and I  
12 know you mentioned the Department of Veteran Affairs. I  
13 want to sort of flip through here, if I can turn the page.

14 And you have other grant work here, and I want to ask  
15 you about your work with the U.S. Olympic Committee.

16 **A** Okay. So in this whole sphere of work that I do that  
17 involves measuring abilities like for chess players, I've  
18 been able to move that over to apply it to not just, like,  
19 chess, but also sports.

20 So I've over the years in this, I guess this one entry  
21 in my CV is an example, I've established some research  
22 contracts with the U.S. Olympic Committee to help them  
23 figure out how to gage the strength of athletes; not just  
24 the athletes that are U.S. athletes, but athletes  
25 internationally.

1           And the purpose for doing that is they want to be able  
2 to figure out, for example, you know, whether they should  
3 send U.S. athletes to certain international events and  
4 decide whether or not the competition that I figured out how  
5 strong they are, if they're going to just like wipe them  
6 out, in which case, you know, they probably don't want to  
7 send the U.S. athletes to those competitions.

8           So that's -- you know, that's one area of work that  
9 I've done with the U.S. Olympic Committee.

10          **Q**        Okay. Now, I always tell folks this isn't the time to  
11 be humble, so let's talk about your awards. Can you just  
12 tell us about some of the awards that you've received?

13          **A**        So I have a bunch of awards for teaching. I was, you  
14 know, given certificates of distinction in teaching when I  
15 was a graduate student.

16           One of the awards that I guess I'm most proud of is my  
17 being an elected -- being elected a fellow of the American  
18 Statistical Association. So that's an award that recognizes  
19 achievement in statistics, and that's given to one-third of  
20 1 percent of all of its members on a yearly basis. And so I  
21 earned that in 2014.

22           Based on a lot of the work that I've done with U.S.  
23 Chess, I guess I've received two awards. One as recent as  
24 two years ago that was a Distinguished Service Award, and  
25 then previously I received a Special Services Award from the

1 executive board. And this is all related to the work that  
2 I've done with rating chess players and getting involved in  
3 the rating of chess players.

4 **Q** And with respect to the American Statistical  
5 Association, and I guess I shouldn't be surprised that a  
6 statistician knows that it was offered to one-third of 1  
7 percent of all people, but do you have other involvement  
8 with that organization?

9 **A** Yeah. I mean, so the American Statistical Association  
10 is -- it's really the main organization, the main  
11 professional organization for statisticians in the U.S.,  
12 North America, and for some people around the world.

13 I'm on the Board of Directors of the American  
14 Statistical Association. So it's a 12-member Board. We  
15 meet four times a year, have lots of e-mail exchanges. And  
16 I'm finishing up my term this year; in fact, two weeks from  
17 now we have our final Board meeting of the year. But  
18 that's -- you know, so I've been involved in the  
19 administration of statistics and organizational issues and  
20 various opportunities for statisticians.

21 And I've also been involved in a particular -- well,  
22 in what's called the section on Statistics and Sports. This  
23 is the subset of members that are particularly interested in  
24 the intersection between statistics and sports and being  
25 able to help them with opportunities, as well.

1       **Q**      Dr. Glickman, are you published?

2       **A**      Yes. I publish my work.

3       **Q**      And in your CV, I think if we started flipping  
4      through, we have -- see if I can pull it up a little bit  
5      more here -- page after page here, it looks like, of  
6      articles.

7                  Can you give a sense to the jury of approximately how  
8      many different articles you've written?

9       **A**      So I've written 82 or 83, depending on how you count;  
10     well, on this CV you count 82. I have 82 peer-reviewed  
11     publications, and then I have a number of other manuscripts  
12     that are not peer reviewed; but in total I guess we're, you  
13     know, adding up to maybe 110 publications.

14      **Q**      And you mentioned the CV. Do you have an additional  
15     article that you've written since you offered the CV?

16      **A**      Yeah, I think since this version I have one other  
17     article that was accepted for publication about a month ago.

18      **Q**      So you're here to talk about statistics.

19      **A**      I am here to talk about statistics.

20      **Q**      Some of us are more numbers people than others. We're  
21     going to be given some very important information today, but  
22     also I want to keep it interesting for the jury. So could  
23     you tell us maybe one or two of your articles that are maybe  
24     more interesting to those of us that aren't numbers  
25     inclined?

1       **A**       Sure. So one of the areas that I got into pretty  
2 recently is the intersection between statistics and music.

3                   So a couple years ago I was working with a  
4 collaborator from Dalhousie University. We both discovered  
5 that we're huge Beetles fans, and we ended up landing on  
6 this project where we took all the Beatles songs that were  
7 written by Lennon and McCartney, and based on musical  
8 features of those songs we ended up constructing a  
9 statistical model that would predict whether the song was  
10 written by John Lennon or whether it was written by Paul  
11 McCartney.

12                  So you may be thinking, well, why bother, what's the  
13 point of that. The reason is there are actually a number of  
14 Beatles songs, I should say Lennon and McCartney songs,  
15 they're actually of disputed authorship. One of the songs  
16 is the song "In My Life," which is, according to *Rolling*  
17 *Stone*, the -- I think it's the 23rd best song of all of rock  
18 and roll.

19                  So the way we did is we ended up applying our  
20 statistical model to that particular song and determined  
21 that with very high likelihood John Lennon wrote most of it  
22 and Paul McCartney helped write on the bridge. And so that  
23 ended up getting some media attention, and that was kind of  
24 a fun project.

25                  I'll mention one other, which is in a completely

1 different sphere if you're not a rock person. I ended up  
2 working with a student where we ended up coming up with a  
3 computer generation of pieces that would sound like Bach  
4 chorales. So using some rules of music, we were able to  
5 come up with a statistical procedure that would randomly  
6 generate music that would sound like Bach.

7 We ended up giving it to like a bunch of music experts  
8 to judge whether or not what they were hearing was actually  
9 Bach or whether it was computer-generated music, and they  
10 did no better than guessing. So that was kind of a fun  
11 project as well.

12 **Q** And do you also give presentations? And I think if we  
13 wanted to flip again, we would be looking at sort of pages  
14 and pages of select presentations. But if you could give  
15 the jury a sense of what types of things you typically  
16 present on.

17 **A** So I've given a number of presentations. Most of  
18 these presentations tend to track with articles that I'm  
19 writing. Very typically when academics end up working on  
20 research and they're writing their articles, they also  
21 simultaneously give talks on their work to essentially, you  
22 know, share the work that you're doing and, you know,  
23 essentially advertise the work that you're involved in.

24 So most of these talks are connected very -- very  
25 specifically to the papers that I wrote.

1       **Q**     And bring it back to healthcare too.

2                  Have you given presentations relating to statistics  
3                  and healthcare?

4       **A**     Yeah, absolutely, for some of the papers that I've  
5                  written are related to healthcare.

6       **Q**     Switching subjects a little bit. Have you ever been  
7                  engaged as an expert before?

8       **A**     Yes, I have.

9       **Q**     How many times, approximately?

10      **A**    As a testifying expert or just in general?

11      **Q**     Let's start with a testifying expert.

12                  How many times have you testified as an expert?

13      **A**     This would be I think my fourth time.

14      **Q**     And can you just give, maybe pick a couple examples of  
15                  when you've testified in court as an expert in statistics?

16      **A**     Yeah. The last time I testified was a few years ago  
17                  in a case in Boston which involved a patron at a Red Sox  
18                  game getting hit by a foul ball and getting injured pretty  
19                  severely, and then she brought a suit against the Red Sox.

20                  And the Red Sox hired me as a statistician  
21                  specifically to estimate the probability of getting injured  
22                  by a foul ball in the area of the stadium where she got hit,  
23                  and essentially assessed that it's a low probability, and so  
24                  that was the role that I played.

25      **Q**     So I'll confess, I had a picture of Fenway Park, and

1       then I was told that folks in Cleveland don't like the Red  
2       Sox very much, so I removed that; so hopefully they won't  
3       hold that against you.

4           So give another example of one you've testified in  
5       court.

6       **A**       So before that I was involved in a case involving the  
7       fraudulent selling of some coins on the Internet, and I was  
8       brought into this case at the restitution phase. So these  
9       were defendants that were already convicted, they were found  
10      guilty, and so I was brought in at the phase where they were  
11      awarding damages.

12           My involvement was they had experts evaluate the value  
13       of the coins that were being fraudulently sold, and then  
14       they were taking that set of coins and trying to extrapolate  
15       to all the coins that they would end up selling to get like  
16       an overall damages calculation.

17           My involvement was to be able to assess whether the  
18       procedure of extrapolating from that set of coins, a small  
19       set that were closely followed and valued, to the entire set  
20       of coins, and what the problems were with how the plaintiffs  
21       were handling that.

22       **Q**       Okay. And so I'm now stating the obvious, and don't  
23       take offense to this question.

24           But you're not a baseball player?

25       **A**       I'm not a baseball player.

1       **Q**      You're not a coin collector?

2       **A**      I'm not a coin collector.

3       **Q**      So what allows you to testify as an expert in these  
4                  types of cases if you don't have the sort of underlying  
5                  substantive expertise about what that case is about?

6       **A**      Right. Well, my expertise is in statistics and  
7                  quantitative methods, so I'm not bringing in expertise in  
8                  the substantive area. I'm bringing in expertise in how to  
9                  analyze data and work with data and make sense out of data.

10      **Q**      And before we turn into the meat of your observations,  
11                  I want to do a few other housekeeping items.

12                  Are you being paid for your work in this case?

13      **A**      I am getting paid, yes.

14      **Q**      How much do you charge per hour?

15      **A**      I charge \$700 per hour.

16      **Q**      And approximately how much have you made on this case  
17                  to date?

18      **A**      I would estimate about 130 to 140,000.

19      **Q**      And actually, backing up to your expert testimony,  
20                  have you ever testified in an opioid litigation before?

21      **A**      I have never testified in an opioid litigation, no.

22      **Q**      And other than what you just testified to, are you  
23                  receiving any other compensation for this case?

24      **A**      I am not, no.

25      **Q**      Do you consider yourself an expert in statistics?

1 | A Yes, I do.

5       **A**       Yes. I was provided McCann's -- Dr. McCann's reports,  
6 his data. I received a bunch of deposition testimony. I  
7 reviewed a bunch of literature. And that informed the  
8 opinions that I'm going to be presenting.

9 Q Did you review an expert report by Mr. Catizone?

10 | A Yes, I did, yeah.

11 Q And did you read deposition testimony from both of  
12 these experts from plaintiffs as well?

13      **A**      I did, yes.

14 Q Are all the opinions you are offering today being  
15 offered to a reasonable degree of professional certainty?

16      **A**           They are, yes.

17 Q And I'll just ask that in response to all of my  
18 questions that you hold yourself to that standard in the  
19 testimony you give.

20 | **A** I will.

21 Q Okay. So as we dive into the specifics of your  
22 testimony today, did you work with me to create some slides  
23 to aid in your testimony?

24      **A**      Yes, I did.

25 MS. FUMERTON: Can we please bring up the

1       first slide. We're getting there. Perfect.

2   **Q**     So, Dr. Glickman, could you just give a general  
3       preview of the topics that we're going to cover today.

4   **A**     Sure. So I'm going to be discussing with you three  
5       main areas of the work that I did.

6           So the first is essentially characterizing opioid  
7       dispensing by Walmart in Lake and Trumbull Counties. I'll  
8       go through that a little bit.

9           I'll also be discussing some specifics about the red  
10       flagging method, so specifically focusing on Mr. Catizone's  
11       and Dr. McCann's red flag algorithm logic.

12          And then I'll finish up by describing a particular  
13       approach that Dr. McCann provided in calculating what are  
14       called confidence intervals. And I'll be discussing that  
15       event.

16   **Q**     Let's start with your analyses of the Walmart  
17       pharmacies in Lake and Trumbull Counties.

18          If we could have the next slide, please.

19          And there are -- the jury has heard this before, but  
20       there are five Walmart pharmacies in Lake and Trumbull  
21       County; is that right?

22   **A**     That's right.

23   **Q**     Okay. And can you give the -- I guess tell the jury  
24       what are a preview of the four different types of  
25       observations that we're going to discuss.

1       **A**       Right. So within characterizing Walmart pharmacies,  
2 what I'm going to be doing is discussing Walmart's fairly  
3 limited presence in these counties with respect to opioids.  
4 I'm going to be contrasting the Walmart pharmacies with  
5 several independent pharmacies.

6                  I'll also be discussing something called the  
7 controlled substances ratio, essentially examining how the  
8 fraction of controlled substances dispensed by Walmart, what  
9 they look like. And then I'll also be showing you a slide  
10 on opioid prescriptions per capita. Essentially it's a way  
11 of measuring the number of prescriptions that are per capita  
12 that are dispensed.

13      **Q**       Okay. Let's have the next slide, please, and start  
14 out with your sort of first observations.

15                  What are we looking at here? Maybe we can make it a  
16 little bit bigger so it's easier for the jury to see.

17      **A**       Thank you. So this is a table that I'll describe a  
18 couple of the main pieces, but I'll describe a little bit  
19 more detail maybe in one or two slides later.

20                  This is essentially a summary of the nondefendant  
21 dispensers and the defendant dispensers by Lake County,  
22 Trumbull County, and then combine together.

23                  I want to point out that in this set of data there are  
24 168 nondefendant dispensers, which includes pharmacies, but  
25 there's also some clinics and other, like, hospitals. And

1 also there are 17 -- I'm sorry, so that's for Lake County.

2 And then for Lake County there are 17 defendant dispensers.

3 **Q** And let me stop you there.

4 When you're referring to defendant dispensers, who are  
5 you referring to?

6 **A** So I'm referring to Walmart, Walgreens, and CVS.

7 **Q** Okay. And we actually have a couple charts here, so  
8 I'm going to skip ahead to the next one. But first, for the  
9 record, this has been identified as WMT-MDL-01540A.

10 And did you put the summary of data together?

11 **A** I did, yes.

12 **Q** Okay. Let's look at the next one, and I'll have you  
13 talk about the method that you did that a little bit more in  
14 depth.

15 (Court reporter interjection.)

16 MS. FUMERTON: I'll slow down. I apologize  
17 for that.

18 **Q** Okay. Let's turn to the next slide, please.

19 All right. For the record, this has been marked as  
20 WMT-MDL-01541A.

21 And Dr. Glickman, can you tell us what we're looking  
22 at here?

23 **A** Right. So this is a table that it's formatted pretty  
24 much the same way as the table you just saw, but it's  
25 focused specifically on the defendant pharmacies, so CVS,

1 Walmart, and Walgreens.

2 Again, that first column is telling you the number of  
3 dispensers within each county, and then combined by just  
4 basically adding them up.

5 More importantly, the set of -- there's a set of  
6 columns that says "all drugs" and there's a set of columns  
7 that says "oxycodone and hydrocodone."

8 What these are displaying is information on the  
9 dispensing of opioids. And what it can do is -- I guess I  
10 could tell you that the column that is labeled "MME" is the  
11 so-called morphine milligram equivalent. This is  
12 essentially telling you in units that can be compared across  
13 different medicines what the total number of these  
14 particular units is aggregated by the different pharmacies.

15 So, for example, for Walmart in Lake and Trumbull  
16 County, I don't know if you want to highlight that 99  
17 million.

18 **Q** Yeah, I was just going to say. I want to focus on --  
19 let me ask you a couple questions here. Let's -- if we can  
20 get that Walmart line focused, that's what I'm particularly  
21 interested in in talking to you about today.

22 You mentioned MME and dosage units.

23 Why do you have it sort of listed here both ways?

24 **A** Well, so these are two different ways of understanding  
25 how opioids are dispensed. So dosage units are just like,

1 you know, pills or patches or lozenges. Those are just like  
2 the individual units that are being dispensed.

3 The problem, of course, is that if you're trying to  
4 say that there's a certain amount of opioids that are being  
5 prescribed by pill, and you prepare them, you know, between,  
6 say, two pharmacies, you don't know whether one set of pills  
7 is more -- like, contains more potency in the medication  
8 than another.

9 So comparing by pills isn't really quite the right  
10 comparator. So instead, what you can do is you can convert  
11 them into this thing called MME.

12 And so MME puts everything on the same baseline. It's  
13 the -- you know, if you have two pharmacies that are  
14 dispensing the same MMEs, in total what they're doing is  
15 they're dispensing the same potency of opioids aggregated  
16 across all of the medications, all the prescriptions.

17 **Q** All right. Thank you for that explanation.

18 Actually, I want to focus then on that MME column, and  
19 specifically on sort of what did you observe as to what  
20 Walmart's share of opioids dispensed in Lake and Trumbull  
21 Counties by MME is attributed to Walmart.

22 **A** Right. So based on this data set -- based on the data  
23 set I'm using, I can aggregate all of the MMEs in the county  
24 that are dispensed across all of the pharmacies in the  
25 entire set of two counties. And then what I can do is I can

1 look at the fraction of the MMEs that are dispensed  
2 particularly by Walmart.

3 And so that ratio of the total MMEs dispensed by  
4 Walmart over the entire set of MMEs dispensed by all  
5 dispensers in the county is the share. It's the share of  
6 the Walmart MMEs for those sets of counties.

7 **Q** And where do you see that number here on this chart?

8 **A** And so that number that's sort of being highlighted is  
9 that 3.15 percent.

10 **Q** Okay.

11 **A** So the 3.15 percent means that out of all the MMEs  
12 that have been dispensed in 2006 to 2014 in Lake and  
13 Trumbull Counties, 3.15 percent of them have been dispensed  
14 by Walmart.

15 **Q** Okay. So I want to dig into this a little bit more,  
16 particularly on this chart.

17 You mentioned the data set. What is the data set that  
18 you're using?

19 **A** Right. So the data set that I'm using is a version of  
20 the ARCOS data. And this is the data set that the DEA  
21 compiles based on, you know, these dispensers and  
22 distributors making their opioid data available.

23 This was a data set that was used by Dr. McCann, and  
24 we ended up using that set of data.

25 **Q** Okay. So let's take down our 3.15 percent for a

1 second, and I want to walk through for the jury just so they  
2 understand, because I think sometimes people are throwing  
3 out numbers, they wonder are we comparing apples to apples,  
4 what's happening here.

5 So if you can turn to I think it is Tab 4 in your  
6 binder. And I'm going to --

7 MS. FUMERTON: Mr. Pitts, can I have the ELMO,  
8 please?

9 **Q** Do you recognize this document, Doctor?

10 **A** Yes, I do.

11 **Q** And what is this?

12 **A** So this is an appendix from Dr. McCann's reports.

13 **Q** Okay. And how can this be used, if at all, to  
14 calculate market share?

15 **A** Right. So if you turn the page, you're going to see a  
16 listing of dispensers in Lake and Trumbull County over this  
17 time period, 2006 to 2014. And what you'll notice in that  
18 very last column is the total MMEs for each individual  
19 pharmacy over that time period.

20 **Q** And is this ranked in any way? I don't know if you  
21 can sort of see the list here.

22 **A** Yeah, you'll see that it's actually sorted in order  
23 according to that last column, that MME column.

24 **Q** So if we take Franklin Pharmacy and highlight that,  
25 what can you tell about Franklin Pharmacy here?

1       **A**       Right. So that's the pharmacy over this time period  
2       between Lake and Trumbull Counties that has the largest  
3       total MME.

4       **Q**       And this data, to be clear, is Dr. McCann's data; is  
5       that right?

6       **A**       This is Dr. McCann's data, that's right.

7       **Q**       And so you didn't manipulate this in any way. This is  
8       directly from his report?

9       **A**       That's correct.

10      **Q**       And what is the second highest listed pharmacy here?

11      **A**       So the second one is Overholt's Champion Pharmacy.

12      **Q**       Okay.

13      **A**       And both of these, by the way, are independent  
14       pharmacies.

15      **Q**       And if we look at the third one, I think the jury has  
16       heard about Bellevue before too. Where is Bellevue on this  
17       list?

18      **A**       Bellevue is ranked number four in terms of total MMEs.

19      **Q**       Let's talk about Walmart. If we want to get to a  
20       Walmart, where do we start looking?

21      **A**       I believe you need to scroll down this a little bit.  
22       I think if you go two-thirds down the page you'll see  
23       Walmart Store 1863.

24      **Q**       So this is the first Walmart that shows up on this  
25       list; is that right?

1       **A**     Don't ask me to say what number that is.

2       **Q**     I'm sorry, I'm not asking you to count them, but if  
3     we're looking down the list, this is the first time you see  
4     a Walmart; is that fair?

5       **A**     That's correct.

6       **Q**     Okay. So tell me or explain to the jury how then you  
7     can use -- did you essentially use these numbers to  
8     calculate market share, or how did you do that?

9       **A**     Yeah, so basically what you can do is just search for  
10    the Walmart entries in this table. So the one that's just  
11    been highlighted has the 36 million MMEs, you could do the  
12    same thing for each of the other Walmart entries. And there  
13    should be I think five other ones.

14           And when you go through them, take those total MMEs,  
15    add them all up, that's going to be the total contribution  
16    for Walmart; and take that number and divide by whatever  
17    happens to be the total MMEs in the county for that time  
18    period.

19       **Q**     And you mentioned the total counties, so I want to --  
20    or total MMEs.

21           If you turn to Tab 5 in your binder, I want to show  
22    something else to the jury.

23           And do you recognize this document?

24       **A**     Yes, I do.

25       **Q**     And what is this?

1       **A**     This is another appendix from Dr. McCann's reports.

2       **Q**     Okay. And so you mentioned the total numbers. Is the  
3     total number reflected on this chart?

4       **A**     Right. So this is a table that summarizes aggregated  
5     MMEs. So if you look at that third column where it says  
6     "Total MME," that's basically -- Dr. McCann already  
7     aggregated like whole bunches of different types of  
8     dispensers together.

9                  So, for example, that first line is chain pharmacies,  
10    the next line is retail pharmacies, so there are different  
11    kinds of dispensers. And he basically ended up adding up  
12    all of the total MMEs and put them into categories.

13               Now, this table contains all possible categories of  
14    sellers of opioids, and so that bottom number that was just  
15    highlighted is that total, the total for the entire county  
16    over that time period.

17       **Q**     And so just to sort of summarize, if we take all of  
18    the Walmart numbers from this appendix and divide it by the  
19    total share in this appendix, is that how you calculate the  
20    3.15 percent?

21       **A**     Yeah. If you do that division, that will give you  
22    that 3.15 percent.

23       **Q**     And so these are Dr. McCann's numbers. So does this  
24    mean you just agree with Dr. McCann?

25       **A**     Well, I mean, this is based on Dr. McCann's

1 computation -- his data, so I'm agreeing in using the data.

2 **Q** And specific to the 3.15 percent, do you know if

3 Dr. McCann agrees with that calculation?

4 **A** Yes, he does. I mean, he said so in his deposition  
5 testimony.

6 **Q** And so let's turn back to the slide presentation. And  
7 we've been talking about a lot of numbers, and some people  
8 are more visual. So can you just describe what's on this  
9 slide once we get it back up?

10 **A** Okay. Right. So I mean, if looking at numbers and  
11 tables is not your thing, then this might be a nice visual  
12 representation of what I was just describing with this 3.15  
13 percent. Namely, that that very thin blue bar at the bottom  
14 is representing 3.15 percent of all the MMEs dispensed in  
15 Lake and Trumbull County over this time period.

16 We also included two other bars. There's this gray  
17 bar above it which accounts for roughly 25 percent of the  
18 MMEs distributed -- dispensed by the other pharmacy  
19 defendants, and then there's the remaining 72 percent  
20 roughly of opioids that were dispensed by nondefendants.

21 **Q** And what geographic region? Is this specific to Lake  
22 and Trumbull?

23 **A** As the header says, this is for Lake and Trumbull  
24 County. And it is over the 2006 to 2014 time period.

25 **Q** Okay. Let's look to the next slide, please.

1           And I don't know if you can pull it up so folks can  
2 see this on the screen, but it's WMT-MDL-01539.

3           Did you create this chart?

4   **A**    Yes, I did.

5   **Q**    And what are we seeing here?

6   **A**    So this is even -- the top part of this table is even  
7 a further breakdown of the Walmart pharmacies. So now this  
8 is the MMEs by individual pharmacy, so that's what's on the  
9 top.

10          So if you see what the shares column is for total  
11 MMEs, those percentages that you see are the total MME  
12 percentage in the county for each of those individual  
13 Walmarts.

14          What I did though is I compared them just for -- I  
15 compared them to three independent pharmacies which happened  
16 to be those -- the top three or four in the chart that we  
17 looked at earlier.

18   **Q**    And if we turn then to page 7, again for those of us  
19 that might not be completely loving number charts, what do  
20 we have on the next slide.

21          Part of this is my fault because throughout this trial  
22 my eyes have gone, so I said I need everything to be blown  
23 up a little bit bigger for folks, so we're messing with the  
24 size.

25          What did you depict here?

1       **A**     Like, for starters, if you focus your attention on the  
2 left part of that slide, you'll see part of the map that  
3 shows Lake and Trumbull Counties and the locations of the  
4 five Walmart stores, as well as the three independent  
5 pharmacies that we just mentioned, and so it's just showing  
6 the locations. So in particular, the three independent  
7 pharmacies happen to be in Trumbull County.

8                  What I have on the right is essentially summarizing  
9 some of the key information on the table I just showed you.  
10 For all Walmart pharmacies, the share of MMEs that are  
11 dispensed is that 3.15 percent. By comparison, if you take  
12 the three independent pharmacies, take their total MME, and  
13 divide by, you know, the total MMEs dispensed in the county,  
14 it turns out to be 16.5 percent. So there are five times as  
15 many MMEs dispensed in these three independent pharmacies  
16 compared to what are being dispensed in the five Walmart  
17 stores.

18       **Q**     Let's look to the next slide, please.

19                  And this, for the record, is WMT-MDL-01539, and it's  
20 the second page of that.

21                  Could you explain what this summary is?

22       **A**     Yeah. So this is a particular focus of information  
23 that appeared on the previous slide. The previous one was  
24 showing you everything in Lake and Trumbull Counties all put  
25 together. This one is focused particularly on Trumbull

1 County.

2 So if you restrict your attention just to the total  
3 MMEs that are dispensed in Trumbull County, what this is  
4 showing is that for those two Walmart stores that are in  
5 Trumbull County, they account for a total of 1.26 percent of  
6 the entire set of MMEs dispensed in Trumbull County.

7 **Q** And do we have a visual representation of that as  
8 well?

9 **A** I think we're about to.

10 **Q** If you can go to the next slide, please.

11 So what are we seeing here --

12 **A** Right. So the bar -- well, I mean, for starters,  
13 there's Trumbull County in that yellow square, so we know  
14 what stores we're talking about.

15 So Walmart Stores 2197 and 3860 are the two Walmart  
16 stores.

17 **Q** Those are the blue dots?

18 **A** Those are the blue dots. Then the red dots are  
19 Bellevue, Overholt's, and Franklin.

20 And if you flip back actually to the table, just go  
21 back one slide.

22 MS. FUMERTON: You don't have to blow it up  
23 this one time, just to make it easier.

24 **A** Yeah, just to go to the bottom of that page, you'll  
25 see each individual pharmacy contributes, in the case of

1 Franklin it's 12.4 percent total MMEs, 9.06 total MMEs a  
2 share, and then 5.24 percent total MMEs.

3 So each individual pharmacy is contributing these  
4 percentages. If you add all of those up, if you go to the  
5 chart in the next slide, that adds up to a total of 26.7  
6 percent of the total MME share.

7 **Q** Okay. Let's look to the next slide.

8 And what are you depicting here?

9 **A** So in this situation I want to do just a -- you know,  
10 it might be a little bit confusing to be talking about  
11 comparing, you know, three pharmacies with two pharmacies or  
12 five pharmacies with three pharmacies. So what we did is we  
13 just wanted to do just sort of a one-on-one comparison.

14 So just focusing on Franklin Pharmacy, the -- one of  
15 the independent pharmacies, and the Walmart pharmacy that is  
16 closest in location to it, which is this store 2197, we can  
17 do a comparison of the total MMEs at those two stores in  
18 this time period.

19 So in Franklin, there are 241 million MMEs that were  
20 dispensed, and by contrast, in Walmart there are 18.4  
21 million MMEs that were dispensed. These are not  
22 percentages. These are total MMEs that are represented in  
23 the bars.

24 And so for this particular pharmacy, the independent  
25 pharmacy, they dispensed 13 times as many opioids measured

1 by MMEs compared to the nearest Walmart pharmacy.

2 **Q** Okay. And let's look at the next slide.

3 Did you do this for Overholt's Pharmacy as well?

4 **A** Right. So I did the comparison also between  
5 Overholt's and, again, Store 2197, which is the closest to  
6 it.

7 And again, if you look at the chart on the right,  
8 you'll see that there are 176.5 million total MMEs that were  
9 dispensed in Overholt's compared to 18.4 million that were  
10 dispensed at the Walmart pharmacy.

11 And so again, this is a situation where nine times as  
12 many opioids that are being dispensed by MME by the  
13 independent pharmacy compared to the Walmart pharmacy. So  
14 it gives you a sense just sort of the size difference.

15 It's probably worth mentioning though that this  
16 particular pharmacy, Overholt's Pharmacy, pleaded guilty for  
17 opioid dispensing related issues in 2011 and no longer was  
18 dispensing opioids. So in fact, this 176.5 million is not  
19 really over the entire period up through 2014. It's only a  
20 part of that time period.

21 So in fact, even though that it's nine times as many  
22 total MMEs dispensed, it's dispensed over a shorter time  
23 period, whereas the Walmart one is over a longer time  
24 period.

25 So that kind of -- you know, hopefully that makes the

1 point that this number, the 176.5, compared to the 18.4, is,  
2 you know -- like, even though that's a fairly large -- you  
3 know, seemingly large difference in the number of times of  
4 MMEs dispensed, if Overholt's had been in business longer  
5 and dispensed at the same rate, that number would have been  
6 even larger.

7 **Q** Let's look at the next slide, please.

8 And for the record, this is WMT-MDL-01555.

9 Is this another summary you prepared?

10 **A** Right. So this is very similar to the last set of --  
11 last table that you saw, but this time it's only focusing on  
12 oxycodone 80 milligrams and oxycodone 30 milligrams. So  
13 these are just very focused analyses on specific -- these  
14 specific opioids and at their specific dosages.

15 **Q** Okay. And let's look to the next slide. And I think  
16 we have the visual representation that some folks might find  
17 easier to digest.

18 And what are we looking at here?

19 **A** So this is now just showing the fraction of MMEs that  
20 were dispensed for in this case oxy 30 at each of the  
21 particular pharmacies. So if you look at the Walmart  
22 pharmacies on the right, you know, each of these pharmacies  
23 is dispensing in terms of MMEs somewhere between .1 percent  
24 of the overall total MMEs for oxy 30 in Lake and Trumbull  
25 County, up to, like, 1 percent for the Walmart in Madison.

1           So these percentages by comparison to these three  
2 independent pharmacies are much, much smaller. So  
3 Overholt's, Franklin, and Bellevue, respectively contribute  
4 9.8 percent, 17.6 percent, and 8.7 percent of the total MMEs  
5 for oxy 30 in the two counties.

6   **Q**       And if you add up all of the five Walmarts' share of  
7 oxy 30 for Lake and Trumbull County, is that greater than  
8 any of the individual independent pharmacies listed here?

9   **A**       Yes. So if you add up those five percentages, in  
10 other words, you combine all the Walmarts and you look at  
11 the total MMEs for oxy 30 for those Walmarts, the total  
12 share is 1.9 percent. And that's less than any single  
13 independent pharmacy that I ended up showing you.

14   **Q**       All right. Let's look at the next slide. So you did  
15 the same thing for oxy 80; is that right?

16   **A**       Yeah, that's correct.

17   **Q**       And it looks like the Walmart numbers here are even  
18 lower for oxy 80; is that right?

19   **A**       Yeah, it's basically the same kind of story. The  
20 Walmart shares are smaller than what you just saw for oxy 30  
21 on average. And so if you end up adding up the total  
22 contribution for Walmart for oxy 80, they consist of a total  
23 of 1 percent of the entire set of MMEs for Lake and Trumbull  
24 Counties.

25           And if you compare to Overholt's, Franklin, and

1       Bellevue, they have a total MME dispensing shares of 20.3  
2       percent, 17.3 percent, and 4.3 percent.

3       **Q**       Okay. Next slide, please.

4                  And, Dr. Glickman, what are we looking at here?

5       **A**       So, okay, so shifting a little bit, this is a quote by  
6       Kyle Wright, who was a DEA unit chief of Targeting and  
7       Analysis, and this is from a deposition that he gave in  
8       February of 2019.

9       **Q**       And did you review this in preparation for your  
10      report?

11      **A**       Yes, I did. I reviewed the deposition transcript.

12      **Q**       Okay. And what is this slide showing us?

13      **A**       So the questioner asked him: Is it accurate to say  
14      that you knew that it was common for legitimate pharmacies  
15      to have a ratio of approximately 20 percent of controlled to  
16      80 percent noncontrolled?

17                  And his answer was: In that area, yes.

18      **Q**       Okay. So let's look to the next slide then.

19                  And is this another summary that you created?

20      **A**       Yes. So this is another summary I created.

21                  MS. FUMERTON: And for the record, it's  
22      WMT-MDL-01540.

23      **Q**       And can you please explain what you did here.

24      **A**       Sure. So this is using a different data set. This is  
25      using the Walmart's Know Your Customer data set. So what

1       they've been doing is they've been compiling information  
2       about each of their pharmacies just to understand their  
3       practices.

4           So what I was able to pull off this spreadsheet is  
5       essentially the percentage of controlled substances that  
6       were prescribed divided by -- out of the total number that  
7       they were prescribed in any given quarter of the year.

8           So what you're seeing, for example, say, the -- you  
9       know, the number that's to the top and the left, that 11.9  
10      percent?

11          I don't know if you want to highlight that.

12   **Q**       I guess 11.0 percent --

13   **A**       I think it's 9.

14   **Q**       Oh, on the left. I see. I was looking to the right.

15   **A**       Yeah. Did I say right? Yeah, when I said right, I  
16      meant left.

17   **Q**       You were right, I was wrong.

18   **A**       Right. So the 11.9 percent is among all the  
19      prescriptions that were dispensed -- among the prescriptions  
20      that were dispensed at Walmart pharmacy 1857 in the first  
21      quarter, the first quarter of the fiscal year 2016, which,  
22      by the way, happens to correspond to February, March, and  
23      April of 2015.

24           If you examine the percent of controlled substances  
25      that were prescribed, they total 11.9 percent out of the

1 total prescriptions.

2 **Q** And just to be clear, are controlled substances all  
3 opioids?

4 **A** Controlled substances include opioids, but they also  
5 include other kinds of prescriptions. For example, anabolic  
6 steroids, narcotics, depressants. So other kinds of  
7 controlled substances besides opioids.

8 **Q** And you mentioned Walmart's fiscal year, and I think  
9 you described what fiscal -- the first quarter would be.  
10 But generally speaking, when does the Walmart fiscal year  
11 run, do you know?

12 **A** So the Walmart fiscal year runs from February to  
13 January. So when you're seeing these fiscal years of 2016,  
14 2017, and 2018, you should probably be thinking calendar  
15 years 2015, 2016, 2017, because the only representation is  
16 just like this one month. Like the January of that year  
17 that's listed is actually part of the data set.

18 **Q** And looking at all of these individual numbers for  
19 each of the five Walmart pharmacies, are any of them close  
20 to 20 percent?

21 **A** No. All those numbers, every single one of them, is  
22 less than 20 -- that 20 percent that was part of the Kyle  
23 Wright deposition.

24 MS. FUMERTON: And just to prove my earlier  
25 statement that I'm losing my eyesight, my trusted colleague

1 tells me that this document is actually marked  
2 WMT-MDL-01549. I think I misspoke earlier and called that  
3 last "9" a "0."

4 **Q** So let's turn to the next page. So what is  
5 represented here?

6 **A** All right. So going back to the theme of taking this  
7 tabular data and turning it into something that's a little  
8 easier on the eyes, so what we have is essentially this  
9 blue -- this blue dash line where it says DEA, that's that  
10 20 percent. That's the 20 percent that was quoted in the  
11 deposition.

12 And then if you examine the -- those blue dots that  
13 are kind of hovering around this 10 percent line, that shows  
14 all of those different -- for each of the different five  
15 Walmart pharmacies, it's showing the average over each  
16 fiscal year the percentage of controlled substances that  
17 were dispensed.

18 So you see like in the little region that says fiscal  
19 year 2016, there are five dots. Each of those individual  
20 five dots represents the average controlled substance  
21 fraction for that fiscal year. And it's showing that like,  
22 on, you know, the averages are all kind of hovering around  
23 10 percent.

24 **Q** Thank you, Dr. Glickman.

25 All right. Let's look -- switching subjects slightly,

1 what is depicted in this next summary?

2 **A** So this is a slide that represents the total  
3 Walmart -- the total annual prescriptions dispensed by  
4 Walmart per capita for oxycodone and hydrocodone, and it's  
5 probably worth breaking it down a little bit.

6 That first column that says "population," those are  
7 the populations of Lake County, Trumbull County, and the  
8 Lake and Trumbull County, and those are numbers that I  
9 pulled from Dr. McCann's reports.

10 The "total prescriptions" is prescriptions from  
11 Walmart dispensing data, and these are basically just  
12 counting the number of prescriptions of oxycodone,  
13 hydrocodone, in each of these counties.

14 And so in order to get the annual prescription per  
15 capita, you just simply divide the number of total  
16 prescriptions of the opioid divided by the total population  
17 of the area.

18 **Q** Okay. And let me stop you there. I have a few more  
19 questions about this one.

20 MS. FUMERTON: But for the record, this  
21 particular summary you created is WMT-MDL-01536.

22 **Q** And the jury has heard several times from plaintiffs'  
23 counsel about the number of pills per man, woman, and baby.

24 With respect to this particular chart, is this a  
25 different perspective of how to look at the volume that's

1 being distributed?

2 **A** Yeah, this is an alternative way to capture that type  
3 of information.

4 **Q** Because people are not dispensed one pill, they're  
5 dispensed by prescription; is that right?

6 **A** That's my understanding, yes.

7 **Q** And so if we look at oxycodone specifically, and then  
8 I want to sort of just ask what the .016 number represents  
9 under "annual prescriptions per capita."

10 **A** So that .016 comes about by taking the total number of  
11 oxycodone prescriptions in Lake and Trumbull County by  
12 Walmart and dividing it by the population as represented by  
13 this 439,668. And that .016, you know, one way to  
14 understand it is that it basically is saying that 16 people  
15 out of a thousand on average are receiving oxycodone  
16 prescriptions in Lake County.

17 **Q** And that's per year?

18 **A** I'm sorry, per year, per year, on an annual basis.

19 **Q** Okay. Switching subjects. Let's go to the next  
20 slide, please.

21 I think you testified earlier that you reviewed both  
22 Mr. Catizone's expert report as well as Dr. McCann's expert  
23 report. And just to orient everyone, Mr. Catizone  
24 identifies certain red flags and then Dr. McCann purportedly  
25 applied those to the data.

1           Is that a fair assessment?

2   **A**    That's my understanding.

3   **Q**    Okay. So just generally speaking, what are some of  
4       your overall observations, and then we'll walk through these  
5       analyses.

6   **A**    Right. Well, as you see, there are a bunch of  
7       different observations that I'll be making generally having  
8       to do with the dispensing analysis. It might be helpful  
9       just to kind of walk through them one by one.

10   **Q**     Okay. We'll do that.

11           Why don't we go to the next page then, the next slide,  
12      please.

13           And so is this a summary that you created?

14   **A**     Yeah, this -- yes, this is a summary I created.

15           MS. FUMERTON: And for the record, it's  
16      WMT-MDL-01577.

17   **Q**     And what did you do here?

18   **A**     Right. So by way of setting this up, I assume the  
19       jury has been brought up to date on the red flagging of  
20       prescriptions.

21   **Q**     Yes.

22           MS. FUMERTON: For the jury's benefit, the  
23       witnesses testifying don't hear the testimony of everybody  
24       else who's testified already in the trial.

25   **Q**     So, yes, they have heard about Mr. Catizone's 16 red

1 flags.

2 **A** Okay. So what we're seeing here is we have the -- we  
3 have basically two numbers and then from these two numbers  
4 we're going to derive this .9 percent in the last column.

5 The first number is essentially taking all of the red  
6 flag prescriptions by Walmart in the period 2006 to 2014 and  
7 measuring the total MMEs that are -- total MMEs represented  
8 by those red flag prescriptions. So that's a total MME for  
9 red flag prescriptions.

10 And the second number is the total MMEs distributed to  
11 dispensers in Lake and Trumbull County. So this is the  
12 total MMEs in the county that are dispensed by all  
13 dispensers.

14 And so if you take the ratio of the first column, the  
15 total MMEs that were due to the Walmart-flagged  
16 prescriptions and divide that by the total MMEs dispensed in  
17 the entire county, that number comes out to under 1 percent.

18 **Q** I think we have a visual representation of that on the  
19 next slide.

20 So basically can you please explain once we get this  
21 oriented, sort of what then does that .9 percent represent?

22 **A** Right. Again, this .9 percent basically says if you  
23 take the flagged prescriptions, flagged prescriptions by  
24 Walmart, they contribute .9 percent of the entire set of  
25 MMEs that were dispensed in Lake and Trumbull County.

1       **Q**      Let's go to the next slide.

2                  Is this also another observation you made about the  
3                  flagging in Dr. McCann's algorithm as applied to the data?

4       **A**      Yes, this is.

5                  MS. FUMERTON: And for the record, this is  
6                  WMT-MDL-0155. I don't know how many 5s I've said. It's  
7                  WMT-MDL-01550.

8       **Q**      Could you explain what you're depicting here?

9       **A**      Sure. So for every prescription that's in the  
10          dispensing data, one piece of information that's there is  
11          the supply days, like how many days the prescription is  
12          supposed to last.

13                 So what you can do is you can take all of the  
14          prescriptions and chop them up into different groupings  
15          depending on how long the supply lasts.

16                 So if you look at the columns that correspond to 1 to  
17          7 days, 8 to 14 days, and so forth, each of those is  
18          groupings of prescriptions that correspond to the different  
19          supplies of the opioid.

20                 And so what you see is that, you know, of all the --  
21          of all the patients in the data set, there are 49.9 percent  
22          of them that were dispensed opioids that lasted between 1  
23          and 7 days and then, you know, 14.4 percent is for 8 to 14  
24          days, and so forth.

25                 What's relevant here is that there's Ohio

1       Administrative Law, the Ohio Administrative Code defines  
2       acute pain to be pain that lasts no more than six weeks.  
3       And so what we did was we ended up looking at the  
4       prescriptions that corresponded to lengths of supply that  
5       was 42 days or less. So those first four columns  
6       corresponding to 1 to 7 days up through 31 to 42 days, if  
7       you aggregate them together, that's going to give you that  
8       first column.

9       **Q**       And is 42 days 6 weeks?

10      **A**       42 days is 6 weeks because it's 6 times 7. That's  
11       something we learned at Harvard.

12      **Q**       Let's turn to the next page, this visual depiction.

13      **A**       Actually before you do, I just want to make the quick  
14       point that the first row corresponds to all patients, all  
15       prescriptions, and the second row corresponds to patients  
16       that have flagged prescriptions.

17      **Q**       I should have sort of clarified that point too.

18               So when you say all patients, is that all patients in  
19       Lake and Trumbull County for all pharmacies, or is this for  
20       Walmart?

21      **A**       This is just for Walmart, all Walmart patients.

22      **Q**       And the same thing with patients with flagged  
23       prescriptions, it's Walmart prescriptions?

24      **A**       This all refers to Walmart patients.

25      **Q**       Okay. Let's look at the next page then.

1           And so again, what are you visually depicting here  
2 then?

3       **A**     So this is just a visual representation of that first  
4 row. So it's just reminding you that 82.6 percent of all  
5 the patients had prescriptions that were lasting six weeks  
6 or less.

7           And I should mention also, I forgot to mention this,  
8 that's within the 365-day period. So this is -- you know,  
9 it's measuring just with enough gaps in between because, you  
10 know, patients can come in for one acute episode and then a  
11 year later have another acute episode, and those are  
12 considered separate acute episodes.

13     **Q**     So, for example, a patient could have a tooth  
14 extraction in year one and then in year three break a leg?

15     **A**     A knee break or something, yeah.

16     **Q**     Let's look to the next slide and the next summary you  
17 created.

18                   MS. FUMERTON: For the record, this is  
19 WMT-MDL-01583.

20     **Q**     And what is being depicted -- or what have you  
21 summarized here?

22     **A**     Right. So now what we can do is for, again, all these  
23 sets of prescriptions we can see who the -- who the patient  
24 is that was prescribed. And what we can do is we can see,  
25 well, okay, so for a flagged prescription, whether or not

1       they had previously had a prescription filled at that  
2       Walmart.

3           So, like, if you're -- you know, if you fill a -- if  
4       you had a prescription filled at the Walmart and you happen  
5       to have a -- that's a flagged prescription, we can go back  
6       and see whether you have had a prescription previously.

7           And so these are two different versions of the data  
8       set. There's the full flagged data set which consists of  
9       49,243. That's the second row in these two tables.

10          So out of the 49,243 full set of flagged  
11       prescriptions, 44,000 of them involve patients that had a  
12       prior fill.

13       **Q**       And so just to make sure I'm understanding, that means  
14       that there was -- the patient had a flagged prescription,  
15       but that patient had also been at the Walmart filling  
16       another prescription earlier?

17       **A**       That's correct.

18       **Q**       And so perhaps then, you know, you could say that the  
19       pharmacist who's filling that prescription has at least seen  
20       that patient or that Walmart Pharmacy has at least seen that  
21       patient more than once and may know who that patient is?

22       **A**       If it's the same pharmacist, yeah, I suppose.

23           I want to quickly mention, in the first row where it  
24       mentions this 1800, which we'll be talking about I think  
25       later, this is a particular subset of the set of flagged

1 prescriptions.

2 Is it worth mentioning?

3 **Q** Let's clarify that.

4 So the jury has heard about the sample sets, but I  
5 know that you had involvement with that as well. So why  
6 don't you just briefly explain what the 1800 represents and  
7 then what the 49,000 represents.

8 **A** Sure.

9 So I guess more to remind you, I assume, at one point  
10 I was asked to randomly generate a set of 1800 -- 1800  
11 prescriptions out of the full 49,243 for follow-up  
12 information to get extra information about those particular  
13 prescriptions.

14 I'll be describing a little bit later some of the  
15 details of how I generated that data, but for purposes of  
16 this analysis, if we focus on that particular 1800, we get  
17 sort of a similar percentage of prescriptions that have a  
18 patient with a prior fill at the same Walmart store.

19 So in the case of the 1800, we have 93.6 percent, and  
20 in the case of the full set of flagged prescriptions it's  
21 91.1 percent.

22 **Q** So I'm going to say this wrong because I'm not a  
23 statistician, but if we want to think about it, the 1800 is  
24 the sample set of the red flag prescriptions that Dr. McCann  
25 identifies? It's a subset -- so let me back up.

1           The 49,000 is the total number of red flag  
2 prescriptions that Dr. McCann identifies applying  
3 Mr. Catizone's red flags; is that right?

4   **A**    Yes, that's my understanding.

5   **Q**    And then the 1800 is a subset of that 49,000?

6   **A**    The 1800 is a subset that I generated.

7   **Q**    So if we go to the next slide, I think we have a  
8 visual representation of that.

9           And so I think you went through in detail in the last  
10 chart, but just, you know, generally, what are we looking at  
11 here then?

12   **A**    Right. See, these are exactly the same percentages  
13 that were on the table. So what we're seeing is that for  
14 the sample set of 1800, 93.6 percent of them involved  
15 prescriptions where the patient had a prior fill at that  
16 Walmart. And then basically the same idea for the full set  
17 of flagged prescriptions, in this case it's 91.1 percent.

18   **Q**    Moving on to the next set.

19           Did you create this summary which is marked  
20 WMT-MDL-01584? And if yes, what is it showing?

21   **A**    Yes. So I created this.

22           So this is now -- it's almost the same kind of  
23 analysis that we did in the last table, but now from the  
24 point of view of the prescribers. So we can look at every  
25 single one of these prescriptions, see the prescriber who is

1 involved, you know, often a doctor, and we can see what  
2 fraction of those prescriptions involved a prescriber that  
3 had filled a prior prescription at that Walmart pharmacy.

4 **Q** And so if we turn to the next slide, is this a visual  
5 representation of that data?

6 **A** Yeah. So this is, again, a summary, more visual  
7 summary. And what you can see is that in the sample set  
8 there's 94.6 percent of the prescriptions involved a  
9 prescriber who had had a prior fill at that Walmart, and  
10 then similarly for the full set of flagged prescriptions  
11 it's 94.7 percent.

12 **Q** Okay. Let's go to the next slide, please.

13 And as we just discussed, the jury has heard about  
14 Mr. Catizone's red flags. And can you just describe what's  
15 being depicted here on this slide?

16 **A** Sure. So this is, again, another portion of the map  
17 of some of the relevant areas. This is going to be very  
18 particular to red flags 1 and 2; 2 in particular we're going  
19 to focus on in the next slide.

20 So the basic idea here is this circle that is drawn  
21 around Cleveland, if -- the red flag -- the red flags for  
22 flags 1 and 2 are essentially that a prescription is flagged  
23 if the pharmacy where the patient filled their prescription  
24 is more than 25 miles away from their residence. And flag 2  
25 is the same thing except where the prescriber was,

1       typically, their physician.

2           So the reason Cleveland has some particular  
3 significance here is that, you know, suppose you're somebody  
4 who lives in Trumbull County, but all of your healthcare is,  
5 say, at the Cleveland Clinic. Well, according to  
6 Dr. McCann's methods, then any prescription that you get  
7 that is prescribed by a prescriber at the Cleveland Clinic,  
8 it's going to get red flagged. That's just merely because  
9 you ended up going to the Cleveland Clinic to get your  
10 medication prescribed.

11     **Q**       And so let's look -- I have a couple questions about  
12 that, but let's look at the next slide, and then I can ask  
13 my question to clarify that.

14           So what are we looking at here then?

15     **A**       Okay. So we just copied over the map that's on the  
16 left. And what I'm showing on the right here is if you  
17 consider all of the flagged opioid prescriptions where red  
18 flag 2, which is, again, using the distance from the  
19 patient's home to the prescriber, again, typically a doctor  
20 but not always, 33 percent of those prescriptions were red  
21 flagged in this data set, in the dispensing data set.

22     **Q**       And the jury's heard some testimony that, okay, maybe  
23 the 25 miles is not a hard limit, but I want to understand  
24 how Dr. McCann actually applied it.

25           If a patient traveled 24.9 miles to its provider, his

1 or her provider, would that prescription be flagged?

2 **A** That prescription would not be flagged because it is  
3 within 25 miles.

4 **Q** And if the same patient traveled another few blocks,  
5 25.1 miles, would that prescription now become flagged?

6 **A** Yeah, then that prescription becomes flagged because  
7 it's outside the 25-mile radius.

8 **Q** So the 25 miles was applied by Dr. McCann as a rigid  
9 limit; is that a fair characterization?

10 **A** I think that's right, yes.

11 **Q** Let's turn to the next slide.

12 MS. FUMERTON: And for the record, this is  
13 WMT-MDL-01553.

14 **Q** And is this another summary that you created from the  
15 data?

16 **A** Yes, this is.

17 **Q** And did you summarize here?

18 **A** Right. So again, using this -- the entire set of  
19 prescriptions in the Walmart data set, we can determine that  
20 there are 10,759 unique prescribers. Of the ones that  
21 are -- of those set of prescriptions, if you look at all of  
22 the flagged prescriptions, they correspond to 3587 unique  
23 prescribers.

24 So in other words, out of the total number of  
25 prescribers represented in the prescription data set, there

1       are one-third of them that are being flagged, or they're  
2       flagging prescriptions that involve one-third of the  
3       prescribers.

4       **Q**       And just so the jury is clear about this, so for the  
5       Walmart data alone, how many different doctors were  
6       flagged -- or had prescriptions that were flagged under  
7       Mr. Catizone and Dr. McCann's methods?

8       **A**       Right, so that should be 3587. There are 3587  
9       prescribers that ended up getting flagged by virtue of their  
10      prescriptions getting flagged.

11      **Q**       And so that's 3,587 prescribers?

12      **A**       So that's 3,587.

13      **Q**       And if you go to the next slide, is this a visual  
14      representation of that?

15      **A**       Yes, it is.

16      **Q**       And so in other words, I think you said this, does  
17      Mr. Catizone and Dr. McCann's algorithm flag one out of  
18      every three doctors at Walmart's --

19      **A**       Okay. So on average, it's flagging one out of every  
20      three doctors by virtue of the prescription being flagged.

21      **Q**       Let's do one before maybe we'll take a break.

22                  This is a summary that is marked WMT-MDL-01581. And  
23                  the jury has heard testimony about Mr. Catizone's red flag  
24                  number 9.

25                  What did you summarize here?

1       **A**       Right. Again, just to remind everybody, that red flag  
2       9, as it says in footnote number 2, is that a patient was  
3       dispensed two short-acting opioid drugs on the same day.

4                  So what I did was in the first set of columns where it  
5       says 63 and 1981, those are just the count of the number of  
6       those prescriptions that were flagged by red flag number 9.

7                  What I computed was the total number that were flagged  
8       where one of those two prescriptions was methadone.

9       **Q**       And you are not an expert of whether or not methadone  
10      is a short-acting or a long-acting --

11      **A**       I am not.

12      **Q**       The jury has heard from other witnesses though as to  
13      whether or not methadone should appropriately be considered  
14      a short-acting or a long-acting opioid. And so if methadone  
15      is not a short-acting -- let me start over.

16                  If methadone is not a short-acting opioid but is in  
17      fact a long-acting opioid, what does this analysis tell us?

18      **A**       Well, I mean, under the assumption that you're  
19      describing to me, it would seem that the intent of this red  
20      flag is not appropriate if methadone is one of these two  
21      opioids.

22      **Q**       Because what percentage of the sample set  
23      prescriptions that were flagged by red flag number 9 were  
24      flagged because methadone was included?

25      **A**       Well, so it seems that for the full set of red flag 9

1 prescriptions, 48.2 percent of them were flagged that  
2 included methadone as one of the two opioids. And for the  
3 sample set it was 58.7 percent.

4 **Q** And if we turn to the next slide, do we have a visual  
5 representation of that?

6 **A** Right. And so those percentages that I just mentioned  
7 are just being shown in these pie charts here. So in the  
8 case of the sample set, it's 58.7 percent, and in the set of  
9 all flagged prescriptions it's 48.2 percent.

10 **Q** To say this in other words, if methadone should not  
11 have been included, does this mean that red flag number 9 as  
12 applied by Dr. McCann over-flagged prescriptions?

13 **A** If you assume that methadone should not be included in  
14 those pair of opioids, then it would -- then these should  
15 not be included in the red flags.

16 **Q** But Dr. McCann did include them, right?

17 **A** Yeah, my understanding is he included them, yes.

18 MS. FUMERTON: Your Honor, I'm about to switch  
19 to another subject. Is now a good time for a break?

20 THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we'll  
21 take our mid morning break. 15 minutes. Usual admonitions.  
22 And then we'll pick up with Dr. Glickman's testimony.

23 (The jury is not present.)

24 MS. FUMERTON: Your Honor, may Dr. Glickman  
25 also come down?

1                   THE COURT: Sure.

2                   Doctor, you can step down.

3                   THE WITNESS: Okay.

4                   (Recess taken at 10:26 a.m.)

5                   (Jury present in open court at 10:47 a.m.)

6                   THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated.

7                   Dr. Glickman, you're still under oath from this  
8 morning.

9                   And Ms. Fumerton, you may continue, please.

10                  MS. FUMERTON: May it please the Court?

11                  THE COURT: Yes.

12 BY MS. FUMERTON:

13 Q                Dr. Glickman, I think we have two more sets of red  
14 flags to go through and then talk about some confidence  
15 intervals, and at least I'll be done with this portion of  
16 your testimony.

17                 So where we left off I think was on slide 34. If we  
18 could pull that up.

19                 And while we're doing that, I'll just sort of set the  
20 stage. As I mentioned earlier, the jury has heard from  
21 Mr. Catizone and Dr. McCann, and specifically from  
22 Mr. Catizone as to what his red flags mean. And the jury  
23 heard testimony that with respect to red flags 10 and 11,  
24 that he was attempting to apply CDC guidance.

25                 And so did you create the summary that is currently

1 being displayed?

2 **A** Yes, I have.

3 MS. FUMERTON: And for the record, it's

4 WMT-MDL-01585.

5 **Q** And could you please explain to the jury what you  
6 summarized here.

7 **A** Sure. So I guess you're probably aware that red flags  
8 10 and 11 are supposed to pick up dosages that are, you  
9 know, fairly substantial.

10 There's guidance by the CDC that basically says that  
11 as -- that if you are a nonprimary care doctor who's  
12 prescribing for -- for instances of patients who are being  
13 seen by nonprimary care physicians that are experiencing  
14 chronic pain, not acute pain, then these guidelines apply,  
15 these CDC guidelines apply.

16 So the way this flag is set up, it doesn't actually  
17 specifically include these -- you know, the specific aspect  
18 of the nonprimary care doctor and that it's chronic pain.

19 So if you look at the first column, you'll see that  
20 the numbers are for the entire set of flagged, red flag 10  
21 and 11. They're 1,102 -- I'm sorry, I can't read numbers --  
22 1,012 prescriptions that were flagged and then the sample  
23 said it was 43.

24 But out of those, the numbers, if you apply the actual  
25 CDC guidelines based on the, you know, based on chronic pain

1 and on the nonprimary care, there are 983 of them that  
2 shouldn't have been flagged if the guidelines apply. And so  
3 that reduces the set of flagged prescriptions.

4 And so the number that were -- the share of the  
5 prescriptions that were flagged by not incorporating the CDC  
6 guidelines is 95.3 percent in the sample set and 97.1  
7 percent in the full set.

8 **Q** And I just want to make sure that the testimony is  
9 clear. So the CDC guidelines apply to primary care chronic  
10 patients; is that fair?

11 **A** Primary care chronic patients, right.

12 **Q** And so then what you did is looked to see whether or  
13 not when Dr. McCann applied red flags 10 and 11, whether he  
14 applied those flags only to primary care chronic patients or  
15 not; is that fair?

16 **A** That's correct.

17 **Q** And so what you found, then, is that for the  
18 percentages that are reflected in your chart, that there are  
19 a number of red flag -- or number of prescriptions that were  
20 flagged by nonprimary care and for acute patients; is that  
21 fair?

22 **A** I think that's -- yeah, that's fair.

23 **Q** So look at, the next page I think is the sort of  
24 visual representation of that.

25 And so what are we seeing here then?

1       **A**     Well, so you're seeing essentially the visual  
2              representation of the data that's on the table. So once  
3              again, out of the entire set of prescriptions that were  
4              flagged, 95.3 percent of them the CDC guidelines don't apply  
5              in the case of the sample set, and the 97.1 percent of the  
6              prescriptions where the CDC guidelines don't apply to the  
7              entire set of flagged prescriptions by flags 10 and 11.

8              And so only 4.7 and 2.9 percent remain after applying  
9              the guidelines.

10       **Q**     Let's go to the next summary, please.

11              MS. FUMERTON: And for the record, this is  
12              WMT-MDL-01582.

13       **Q**     And did you create this summary?

14       **A**     Yes, I did.

15       **Q**     And can you please explain to the jury what this is  
16              summarizing.

17       **A**     Sure. So this is an instance where we're examining  
18              red flag 15, and red flag 15 has to do with, you know,  
19              checking combinations of opioids. So the specific red flag  
20              is a patient was dispensed more than 210 days of supply of  
21              all opioids combined in a six-month period.

22       **Q**     And let me just stop you there, because the jury has  
23              heard testimony from other witnesses as to, you know,  
24              whether it's appropriate or not to include both short-acting  
25              and long-acting opioids in that calculation.

1           But what did you conclude as to what was actually  
2 done?

3       **A**     Well, what I examined was whether in -- for the  
4 prescriptions that were flagged by red flag 15, whether they  
5 included a short-acting and a long-acting opioid in the set  
6 that was in the -- in any six-month period. And what I  
7 found is that roughly 54 percent in the sample set -- 55  
8 percent in the sample set had both a short-acting and  
9 long-acting opioid.

10           And then in the full set of flagged prescriptions of  
11 red flag 15, 54.7 percent had one short-acting, one  
12 long-acting opioid.

13       **Q**     Okay. Last subject. Let's turn to the next slide,  
14 please.

15           And I want to set this up a little bit just so the  
16 jury understands what we're talking about here.

17           You talked earlier about the sample set and you had  
18 some involvement with that, but I want to back up a little  
19 bit.

20           Is it your understanding that essentially some  
21 mechanism that you were not involved with was set up to  
22 figure out how to choose the randomly selected  
23 prescriptions?

24       **A**     Yeah, there was a framework that was already specified  
25 for how the sample set should be generated.

1       **Q**     Did you understand that that was the Court had set up  
2     that framework?

3       **A**     My understanding, it was the Court that set that up.

4       **Q**     And so once that framework had been set up, what was  
5     your involvement with obtaining the sample set?

6       **A**     Right. So what I was asked to do, I was provided the  
7     entire set of Walmart prescriptions that were red flagged.  
8     And what I was instructed to do was for each individual year  
9     in the set of data that I had, which went from 2010 to 2018,  
10    I was asked to randomly generate 200 prescriptions from each  
11    of those years separately. And that would give over the  
12    nine years a total of 1800 separate prescriptions.

13      **Q**     And you understand that that was something that was  
14    done with respect to each of the defendants' prescriptions  
15    that had been flagged by Dr. McCann?

16                    MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

17                    May we be heard, just very short?

18                    (At side bar at 10:55 a.m.)

19                    MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, the reason for  
20    the objection is that this is -- you ordered or -- yes, you  
21    ordered 10 years of 200 per year. Walmart only produced 9  
22    years; that's why they've only produced 1800, whereas the  
23    other defendants complied with your order and produced all  
24    10 years.

25                    So this setup isn't correct.

1                   THE COURT: I agree, Ms. Fumerton, so you're  
2 going to have to -- you're going to have to correct it  
3 somehow, or I'll have to. I mean, I --

4                   MS. FUMERTON: Your Honor, just to be clear,  
5 I'm not sort of quibbling with that. I was just trying to  
6 establish that this is a random set.

7                   THE COURT: I understand that. That was okay.  
8 But what you brought out is factually incorrect.

9                   MS. FUMERTON: Well, Your Honor, to be clear  
10 about this, and we were up front. There was never any  
11 complaint about this at any point in time. It was actually  
12 back to 2010.

13                  No, I mean, Mr. Weinberger can laugh all he wants, but  
14 it's true.

15                  THE COURT: Whatever. Whether there was a  
16 complaint or not, what you brought out is now factually  
17 incorrect.

18                  MS. FUMERTON: All right. I can clear it up.

19                  THE COURT: All right.

20                  (In open court at 10:56 a.m.)

21 BY MS. FUMERTON:

22 Q               Dr. Glickman, I just want to clarify something with  
23 respect to the sample set.

24                  You understood that sort of the framework that had  
25 been set up was that there would be a random sample of 200

1       prescriptions per year that were chosen. And they're  
2       random, nobody had any influence as to whether it was going  
3       to be prescription A or prescription B or prescription C  
4       that was chosen, it was purely random?

5       **A**       Yes, that's how it was generated.

6       **Q**       And it was applied to the data sets for each  
7       defendant. So in Walmart's case, since Walmart had only  
8       data through 2018 that Dr. McCann had analyzed, that was  
9       applied from 2010 to 2018; is that fair?

10                  MR. WEINBERGER: Objection, Your Honor.

11                  THE WITNESS: Can I respond?

12                  MS. FUMERTON: I think we need to wait for the  
13       Judge.

14                  THE COURT: Overruled.

15       **A**       So basically I was given a spreadsheet that contained  
16       tabs for years 2010 through 2018, and I was asked to  
17       generate 200 randomly chosen prescriptions from within each  
18       of those tabs.

19       **Q**       And the 2010 to 2018 data came from Dr. McCann; is  
20       that what you understood?

21       **A**       I understood that, yes.

22       **Q**       Okay.

23       **A**       Those were the red-flagged prescriptions.

24       **Q**       Okay. So let's talk about confidence intervals. In  
25       layman's terms -- I will confess this is getting into the

1       most sort of specific type of statistic-y -- I don't know if  
2       that's even a word -- type of stuff, but what is a  
3       confidence interval?

4       **A**      Right. So this is starting to get -- you know,  
5       everything you've seen so far has been just, like, numerical  
6       summaries. Now we're starting to get into the guts of  
7       statistical principles.

8                  So the whole idea here is that these 1800  
9       prescriptions, as I understood, were going to be used for  
10       assessing effective due diligence on these prescriptions out  
11       of the 1800.

12                 So for every one of these 1800, either the  
13       prescription satisfied effective due diligence or it didn't.

14       **Q**      And that was according to Mr. Catizone, is that what  
15       you understood, or do you not even know how that analysis  
16       was done?

17       **A**      I only have a vague understanding of what that  
18       analysis is.

19       **Q**      From Mr. Catizone's report?

20       **A**      Yeah, from Mr. Catizone's report.

21       **Q**      So you had no involvement in assessing whether  
22       something was diligence or not diligence?

23       **A**      That's correct.

24       **Q**      Okay. Go ahead.

25       **A**      So the idea is that the whole exercise is -- you know,

1       is to look at -- or the plaintiffs are adding extra  
2       information to those 1800 to be able to assess effective due  
3       diligence of those 1800. But the final step is to  
4       extrapolate from those 1800 to the total set of flagged  
5       prescriptions. In Walmart's case, that's 49,243  
6       prescriptions.

7                   So that's the exercise.

8                   So what you can do is based on the 1800, you can  
9       determine essentially the overall percentage of effective  
10      due diligence, and now what you're trying to do is you're  
11      trying to essentially estimate the effective due diligence  
12      of the 49,000.

13                  You can't get that number exact, so instead what  
14       statisticians typically do is they get a range of values.  
15       So if I end up getting some number that comes from the 1800  
16       as a measure of the percent of effective due diligence, I'm  
17       not going to just simply report a single number that  
18       summarizes the effective due diligence in this larger set.  
19       I'll give a range of values, and that range of values is  
20       often -- is called a confidence interval.

21   **Q**       And so Dr. McCann, do you understand that he applied  
22       confidence intervals to the data?

23   **A**       I didn't see any application of confidence intervals  
24       to any data, but in Dr. McCann's supplementary report he  
25       described a procedure to produce confidence intervals for a

1 sample of 1800, which is precisely the sample that I  
2 generated for the Walmart prescriptions.

3 **Q** And what were your conclusions about the formula? And  
4 I know you created some slides because even I had a hard  
5 time understanding this. So I'm going to completely turn it  
6 over to you to walk us through this and explain sort of  
7 what's happening here.

8 Is it helpful to go to the next slide?

9 **A** No, actually let me walk through these steps.

10 What I actually just described to you in words is  
11 essentially the same thing that I have in order, but just to  
12 anchor ourselves, let me just reread them.

13 So what happens is we start with the 49,243, and then  
14 the way that I was asked to generate a random sample was to  
15 divide the 49,423 [sic] into nine different sets which are  
16 different by year. And it's important to understand that  
17 not every year has the same number of flagged prescriptions,  
18 some years have more than others.

19 So what I did then is that with each of these years'  
20 worth of flagged prescriptions, I randomly -- using a  
21 computer program, which actually -- well, using a computer  
22 program, I generated random samples from within each of  
23 those years, so I got 200 randomly-selected prescriptions  
24 each year of this data set. And that gives me the total of  
25 1800.

1           It is important to remember though that when I'm  
2 generating 200 from one particular year and I'm generating  
3 200 from another particular year, those are necessarily the  
4 same fractions because of the different numbers of  
5 red-flagged prescriptions total in each of those years.

6           All right. So then I relied on Mr. Catizone's  
7 assessment of diligence for each of those prescriptions that  
8 I had nothing to do with.

9       **Q**       And you're not saying whether that was right or  
10      whether that was wrong?

11      **A**       I'm not opining on that at all.

12      **Q**       Okay.

13      **A**       And then there's a procedure that Dr. McCann wrote  
14      about to be able to extrapolate that percent from the 1800  
15      back to the 49,000 and provide this confidence interval.

16           And what I'm here to tell you today is that the  
17      formula that he used is incorrect, based on my experience as  
18      a statistician, and based on my training and my having  
19      taught about confidence intervals for a good part of my  
20      life. I know that the formulas that he used were incorrect.

21      **Q**       And so can you explain, maybe do you have an  
22      illustration as to sort of help the jury understand why they  
23      were incorrect?

24      **A**       Yeah, and there's -- there are several levels in which  
25      the formula is incorrect, but I can illustrate this by just

1 using a made-up example.

2 **Q** Okay. Now the next slide?

3 **A** Yeah.

4 **Q** Great. Tell us when to go to the next slide.

5 **A** Okay. Right. So basically what I'm -- just to  
6 simplify everything, suppose that you have an island that  
7 consists of 10 circles and 10 dots. And so typically you  
8 wouldn't know -- this is going to be like the 49,000  
9 prescriptions. This is the population that we're going to  
10 try to draw conclusions about.

11 So when you look at this island, pretend as if you  
12 don't know that there are 10 -- the 10 circles and 10 black  
13 dots. That's what we're going to try to learn once we get a  
14 sample.

15 So it turns out the first step is to take this island  
16 of 10 circles and 10 black dots and we're going to divide it  
17 up into four different regions. And the reason I'm doing  
18 that is I'm acting like I'm taking the prescriptions and  
19 dividing them up into the different years.

20 There are nine different years, but just in this  
21 illustration I'm just using four.

22 So the aspect of this that will end up leading to a  
23 problem is that it may just so happen that when I divide  
24 this island into the four different regions, they're not  
25 going to divide evenly. Each region is not going to

1 necessarily be evenly white circle and black dot. It's not  
2 going to necessarily be in this 50/50 percent.

3 So if you scroll forward. Suppose that when I just  
4 happened to divide them up, this is how they divide up.

5 And if you go to the next slide, I'm taking these four  
6 regions and I'm pulling them out.

7 Now, what's curious about this particular example,  
8 there are two things to note. Again, I'm not choosing how  
9 to divide up the island into these regions. These are just  
10 like the years, the years 2010 to 2018, in the prescription  
11 data set. Whatever they are, they are.

12 And so in this particular example, it turns out one of  
13 the regions only has black dots, the second region only has  
14 black dots, third region only has black dots, and the fourth  
15 region has mostly circles.

16 Now what I'm going to do is I'm going to select  
17 samples from each of those regions, much in the way that I  
18 selected 200 samples of prescriptions from each of those  
19 years. And if I select in this case two -- you know, two  
20 dots or circles at random, well, in those first three  
21 regions of the island I'm certain to get black dots because  
22 that's all there are in those regions. In that last one  
23 when I do the random sample of 2, I happen to get two white  
24 circles, which is believable because it's mostly white  
25 circles in that region.

1           So what I'm left with at the end of this procedure,  
2 this two-step procedure, by starting with an island that had  
3 50 percent black dots but then I divide it up into different  
4 regions and then sample within each region, I end up getting  
5 a set of dots where 75 percent of them are black and 25  
6 percent of them are white.

7           Now, what McCann would then do is he would take those  
8 75 percent and extrapolate back to the population and say,  
9 well, my best estimate is that it's 75 percent black dots in  
10 the population, and there's some range of values that are  
11 surrounding it just to account for the uncertainty.

12          So this is a biased procedure. It's a biased  
13 procedure in the sense that if you just simply look at the  
14 sample set alone without having factored in dividing the  
15 island into regions, or in the case of prescriptions  
16 dividing the prescription set into different years, you  
17 could go way wrong. You could get a very wrong answer.

18          And to be fair, there are computations that address  
19 this problem, but Dr. McCann didn't apply them in his  
20 description of the calculations.

21       **Q**      Thank you, Dr. Glickman.

22          All right. So let's just wrap this all up. I think  
23 we have a final slide here. We've looked at a lot of  
24 different data, but sort of what are sort of three big  
25 takeaways from, you know, what you've testified today?

1       **A**       Right. So the takeaways are that, first of all, based  
2       on the first set of summaries that I showed you, the Walmart  
3       pharmacies really do have a fairly limited presence in Lake  
4       and Trumbull County, as you've heard, the 3.15 percent  
5       number of shares tossed around as well as the .9 percent of  
6       the flagged prescription shares, so there's a small presence  
7       of Walmart in the opioids in Lake and Trumbull Counties.

8                  I discussed Mr. Catizone and Dr. McCann's red flag  
9       algorithms and how there are certain concerns about how  
10      they're being applied, and I described that for a whole  
11      bunch of different red flags.

12                 And then finally, I gave a little lesson on confidence  
13      intervals and sampling, and described how things can go  
14      wrong if you use Dr. McCann's procedure as he described in  
15      his second report.

16                  MS. FUMERTON: Thank you, Dr. Glickman.

17                  I'm going to pass the witness now.

18                  THE WITNESS: Thank you.

19                  THE COURT: Okay. Anything from Walgreens or  
20      CVS?

21                  MR. STOFFELMAYR: No, Your Honor.

22                  MR. DELINSKY: Nothing, Your Honor.

23                  THE COURT: Thank you.

24                  Then, Mr. Lanier, you're up.

25                  MR. LANIER: Thank you, Judge.

1

- - - - -

2

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

3

BY MR. LANIER:

4

**Q** Hello. I'm Mark Lanier. I met you in the hall for  
about two minutes before you got started this morning.

6

**A** Nice to meet you.

7

**Q** I'm going to be doing your cross-examination, all  
right?

9

**A** Okay.

10

**Q** I've got three stops on your road that I want to cover  
with you. The first one is I want to talk to you about some  
personal magic. The second thing, I want to talk to you  
about statistics as illusions. And then I want to talk  
about reality. All right?

15

**A** Okay.

16

**Q** And I start with personal magic because that's another  
aspect of you that you didn't share with the jury.

18

You've got -- you're a magician, aren't you?

19

**A** I am a magician.

20

**Q** You do sleight of hand tricks, don't you?

21

**A** Yes, I do.

22

**Q** All right. And those can be really impressive. One  
of the key ways of doing it is to distract someone so that  
they don't see what you've done. Fair?

25

**A** I would say I use magic more for entertainment than

1 for distraction.

2 **Q** No, I'm not saying you use it for distraction, but  
3 when you are doing a magic trick, you will draw someone's  
4 attention away from the actual physical sleight of hand,  
5 right?

6 **A** I'm not sure I'd characterize it that way, but I'm  
7 willing to stipulate.

8 **Q** Okay. Let's go to the second, because I want to talk  
9 to you a little bit about statistics.

10 Now, you are a statistician, right?

11 **A** I am, right.

12 **Q** So you know that famous Mark Twain quote about  
13 statistics, right?

14 **A** Which one is that?

15 MR. LANIER: (Writing) Sta-tis-tics.

16 Your Honor, I can't spell. Okay. Hold on.

17 On sta-tis-tics.

18 **Q** You know the Mark Twain quote?

19 **A** I have a feeling I know what you're going to say, but  
20 it's not due to Mark Twain.

21 **Q** Well, he said it was Benjamin Disraeli --

22 **A** It was Disraeli.

23 **Q** -- and he wrongly cites Benjamin Disraeli, but he put  
24 it in his autobiography, Mark Twain did, that there are  
25 three kinds of lies: Lies, damned lies, and statistics.

1           You know that quote, right?

2   **A**    I know that quote, yes.

3   **Q**    It's pretty famous in circles of people who do  
4 statistic work, right?

5   **A**    And cross-examiners, yes.

6   **Q**    Especially if they're cross-examining someone on  
7 statistics. Because you can wind up doing some really funny  
8 things with statistics that give an illusion that may not be  
9 necessarily the truth, can't you?

10   **A**    In the hands of lesser statisticians, I suppose that's  
11 true.

12   **Q**    Well, not just lesser statisticians. I suspect when  
13 you teach class, you teach people that you can do all sorts  
14 of things with statistics, don't you?

15   **A**    I teach them how to appropriately use statistics.

16   **Q**    And you teach them how that statistics can be used  
17 disappropriately, and you show examples of that in your  
18 classes, don't you?

19   **A**    I don't recall ever doing that in my classes, no.

20   **Q**    All right. Well, let me talk about whether or not  
21 you've done that here, okay?

22   **A**    Okay.

23   **Q**    You put up pie charts like this, "patient's flag,"  
24 "patient's flag .9 percent of Walmart's MME share in the  
25 counties." "If you look at the total MMEs dispersed, only

1 .9 percent dispensed by Walmart and flagged by McCann."

2 MS. FUMERTON: Just so the record's clear, it  
3 says "Plaintiffs'" not "patients."

4 MR. LANIER: I'm sorry. Plaintiffs'. Thank  
5 you.

6 Q Do you see this pie chart, sir?

7 A Yes, I do.

8 Q And that gives an illusion of this being a really  
9 insignificant part, doesn't it?

10 A I wasn't stating whether it's significant or  
11 insignificant.

12 Q Because for you to state that would be to give a false  
13 piece of conclusion, wouldn't it?

14 A Well, it's not my realm of expertise to say whether  
15 it's appropriate or not appropriate.

16 Q But you will agree that the illusion here is that  
17 that's such a small piece of pie, it really doesn't count?

18 A Well, you know, when I'm presenting in a tabular form,  
19 it's often pretty difficult and very well known that it's  
20 hard to sometimes recognize the meaning of numbers in a  
21 table. Visualizations can often help.

22 Q Right. I just want to make sure that we're clear on  
23 whether or not there's an illusion here.

24 What's the population of the United States?

25 A Off the top of my head, I don't know the answer to

1       that.

2   **Q**     Off the top of my head, looking at Google while you  
3       were on the stand, it was 329.5 million for 2020. All  
4       right.

5           What's the population of Lake and Trumbull County?

6   **A**     I don't know that answer.

7   **Q**     Well, you had it in your charts. You were looking at  
8       it earlier.

9   **A**     Yeah, I don't recall offhand.

10   **Q**     All right. Right at 450,000, all right?

11           Now, if I wanted to do a pie chart then comparing the  
12       population of Lake and Trumbull County to the United States  
13       of America, I could do that, couldn't I?

14   **A**     Sure, you could do that numerically.

15   **Q**     You could just get the old pie chart constructor  
16       program and put 3.295, dot dot dot dot, except 450,000,  
17       right?

18   **A**     Yeah, those are the numbers you put in.

19   **Q**     And if you did that, you could get a pie chart that  
20       would show what part of the United States of America is Lake  
21       and Trumbull County, right?

22   **A**     By population, yes.

23   **Q**     And so if I were trying to argue in this case, oh,  
24       gee, there's not an epidemic in Lake and Trumbull County,  
25       there's nothing significant about them in the United States,

1       they're just .13 percent of the whole country, that's not  
2       fair to say, is it?

3       **A**       Well, I wasn't making that evaluation in the analyses  
4       that I was doing.

5       **Q**       Yeah, but answer my question, please, here.

6                  That's not fair to say, is it?

7       **A**       I don't think it's fair or unfair.

8       **Q**       Well, yeah --

9       **A**       It is what it is.

10      **Q**       You can't say that the people of Lake and Trumbull  
11       County and their epidemic are insignificant in the national  
12       eye simply because their population is .136 percent, can  
13       you?

14      **A**       I would -- I don't know of anybody who would interpret  
15       that pie chart that way. I certainly wouldn't.

16      **Q**       Well, by the same token, people should not be  
17       interpreting your pie chart to say that the .9 percent  
18       dispensed by Walmart is insignificant, should they?

19      **A**       I never said it was insignificant.

20      **Q**       Because it could be quite significant depending upon  
21       what it is, true?

22      **A**       I have no basis for saying whether it's significant or  
23       not significant.

24      **Q**       But the lawyers sure shouldn't be using your testimony  
25       to try to say it's not significant, should they?

1 MS. FUMERTON: Objection.

2 THE COURT: Sustained.

3 **Q** Sir, you are not providing testimony to the jury that  
4 this is significant or insignificant, are you?

5 **A** That is correct.

6 **Q** By the same token, as we're on this question of  
7 illusion, let's look at market share.

8 You testified about market share, correct?

9 **A** Of what now?

10 **Q** Market share of opioids. You looked at this chart,  
11 "12 opioid drug shipments to pharmacies in Lake County and  
12 Trumbull County."

13 Remember that?

14 **A** I do, yes.

15 **Q** And when you looked at that chart, you are first,  
16 let's be clear, relying on Dr. McCann's work, aren't you?

17 **A** I am, yes.

18 **Q** You don't have any reason to think he was wrong there,  
19 do you?

20 **A** I wasn't making any disputes about the data he was  
21 using.

22 **Q** Yeah, you would not use his data if you thought it was  
23 unreliable, would you?

24 **A** That's correct.

25 **Q** So now we look at what you did with the data.

1            You don't add up all of the defendants when you simply  
2 reproduce his chart, do you?

3   **A**       I wasn't trying to reproduce his chart.

4   **Q**       Well, that's what we were given, is -- this is his  
5 chart, isn't it?

6   **A**       Well, yeah, that is his chart. That's from his  
7 appendix.

8   **Q**       Yeah. And this is what was shown to the jury that you  
9 testified about, right?

10   **A**      Correct.

11   **Q**       And so you don't add up -- let's see, we've got  
12 Franklin and Overholt's at the top.

13            You don't add up all of the CVS, Walgreens, Walgreens,  
14 Walgreens, Walgreens, Walgreens, Walgreens, CVS, Walmart,  
15 CVS, Walgreens, Walgreens, Walgreens, CVS, Walgreens,  
16 Walmart, CVS, Walgreens, CVS, CVS, Walgreens, CVS,  
17 Walmart, Walmart, CVS.

18            You don't add all of those up, do you?

19   **A**       For what chart are you referring to?

20   **Q**       I'm referring to your -- you use an MME chart. You  
21 don't do a dosage unit chart, do you?

22   **A**       You'll have to -- I think you'll need to specify which  
23 exhibit you're referring to.

24   **Q**       All right. We'll look at it as we keep going.

25            But at least you would agree it might be important to

1 add up all of the pills they're pumping into the county and  
2 not simply look at one store, fair?

3 MS. FUMERTON: Objection.

4 THE COURT: Overruled.

5 **A** I was adding up all the MMEs across all the dispensers  
6 in Lake and Trumbull County.

7 **Q** Well, not always, sir, because you produced charts  
8 like this. "Contrast to independents dispensing levels."

9 Do you see that?

10 **A** So for this particular chart, I was comparing the  
11 total MMEs for Overholt's versus the one Walmart store.

12 **Q** Yeah, and I'll ask you these questions in seriatim.

13 Do you see that is my first question?

14 **A** I sure do.

15 **Q** And in this chart, sir, what you did is not compare  
16 Overholt's to all of the Walmarts that are pumping in in the  
17 county, you compared them to one Walmart store, didn't you?

18 **A** That's correct.

19 **Q** And that's not the only time you did that. You did  
20 that with other slides as well, didn't you?

21 **A** If you point to the exhibits, I can answer.

22 **Q** It's the very next one I've got up here now, where you  
23 compared Franklin Pharmacy to one Walmart store, correct?

24 **A** That is correct.

25 **Q** Okay. And in truth, even just looking at the county

1 isn't necessarily doing a thorough and adequate job, is it?

2 **A** I'm not sure exactly what you're referring to.

3 **Q** Well, it's common sense, I would think, that the  
4 counties don't give the full picture. Correct?

5 **A** The picture of what? I'm not sure what you're  
6 referring to.

7 **Q** Of how many pills were put into the counties, of where  
8 they came from.

9 **A** Well, one of my exhibits does actually include the  
10 entire set of pills -- or the MMEs that were dispensed in  
11 Lake County, Trumbull County, and the two combined.

12 **Q** But even that, sir, that's what I'm saying, the  
13 counties don't give the full picture.

14 Have you -- look, I live in Houston. We have  
15 hurricanes. We had one that just busted our chops.

16 **A** I remember that one.

17 **Q** And I want to tell you something. When the water  
18 comes into the hallway, the flood doesn't just stop in the  
19 hallway. It seeps into the bedrooms, it seeps into the  
20 bathrooms, and it seeps into the living room and the  
21 kitchen.

22 Did you know that?

23 **A** Yes, I did.

24 **Q** And the reason I say that is because you put up charts  
25 like this talking about Walmart's limited --

1 MS. FUMERTON: Objection. We actually  
2 didn't --

3 THE COURT: Overruled.

4 MS. FUMERTON: Your Honor, that chart was not  
5 used today.

6 THE COURT: Well, is this in his report?

7 MS. FUMERTON: No, Your Honor.

8 MR. LANIER: It was produced to us last night  
9 to be used today and --

10 THE COURT: Let's go on the headphones a  
11 minute.

12 MR. LANIER: Your Honor, I can ask it a  
13 different way.

14 THE COURT: All right, fine.

15 MR. LANIER: In the interest of time, I'll ask  
16 it a different way.

17 THE COURT: All right, thank you.

18 BY MR. LANIER:

19 Q Sir, this will be my chart, not yours.

20 By the way, did you --

21 A You're taking credit for my work?

22 Q Okay. No, now I'm not.

23 So you did this chart, didn't you?

24 A Yes, I did.

25 Q Thank you. Then I can ask you about it.

1           Sir, these are the Walmarts that you took into  
2 account, these five stores, isn't it?

3       **A**     Yes. And those are the ones that I was asked to  
4 consider.

5       **Q**     So the fact that Hermitage, Pennsylvania, is 4.5 miles  
6 from Trumbull County and there's a store just 4 1/2 miles  
7 away, you didn't consider that store, did you?

8                   MS. FUMERTON: Objection.

9                   THE COURT: Overruled.

10      **A**     I did not consider that. It was not part of the data  
11 set that I was working with.

12      **Q**     And that Greenville, Pennsylvania, is just 10 miles  
13 from the county line; you didn't consider the Greenville  
14 store either, did you?

15      **A**     It was not considered as part of the data I was  
16 analyzing.

17      **Q**     And that Austintown -- or, no, is that --

18                   MR. WEINBERGER: It's Austintown, yeah.

19                   MR. LANIER: I'm sorry. It goes down here?

20                Okay. Here's my local guru.

21                Get over here, geek.

22                Oh, okay. Well, I thought Poland was in Europe.

23      **Q**     Is this -- Austintown and Poland, you didn't consider  
24 the stores there, did you?

25      **A**     They were not part of the data set I worked with.

1       **Q**       And I know where Ashtabula is because it's in a Bob  
2 Dylan song. Do you listen to Bob Dylan?

3       **A**       I never really followed Bob Dylan very carefully, I  
4 was more of a Beetles guy.

5       **Q**       "You're Gonna Make Me Lonesome When You Go."

6                  "I'll look for you from Honolulu, San Francisco,  
7 Ashtabula."

8                  You didn't consider those stores, did you?

9       **A**       I did not, no.

10      **Q**       You didn't consider the stores in Chardon, Burton --  
11                  MR. WEINBERGER: "Chardon."

12      **Q**       Okay -- in these other towns either, did you?

13                  MS. FUMERTON: Objection, Your Honor. Could  
14 we be heard?

15                  MR. LANIER: I'll just do it this way, Judge.

16                  THE COURT: All right. The jury is to  
17 disregard the last question.

18                  MR. LANIER: Yeah, I didn't say the name right  
19 anyway.

20      **Q**       My whole point is, you've narrowed your focus down to  
21 these five stores, assuming that only pills from these five  
22 Walmarts entered into those counties. Isn't that true?

23      **A**       I did, but that was because I was responding to the  
24 analyses that Dr. McCann was performing, so I was  
25 essentially mimicking analyses using his data.

1       **Q**       Well, don't blame him for what you're testifying for,  
2                   sir. You've got -- you're drawing your conclusions. That's  
3                   different than the conclusions he drew.

4                   You understand that?

5       **A**       Not entirely, no.

6       **Q**       Okay. You weren't in here for his testimony, were  
7                   you?

8       **A**       No.

9                   MS. FUMERTON: Objection, Your Honor. We've  
10                  addressed this.

11                  THE COURT: The jury is to disregard that.

12                  Everyone knows he wasn't here because he wasn't allowed to.

13       **Q**       Exactly. That's my whole point, sir. Everybody knows  
14                  you weren't in here for that. You haven't been able to read  
15                  it, correct?

16       **A**       I read his reports, but I'm not aware of his testimony  
17                  here.

18       **Q**       All right. So when you do this type of work and you  
19                  make these type of decisions, I've got to ask you this  
20                  question.

21                  Did you see who the top five prescribers were for  
22                  Walmart?

23                  MS. FUMERTON: Objection. Scope.

24                  THE COURT: Overruled.

25       **A**       What do you mean by "the top five prescribers were for

1 Walmart"?

2 **Q** Well, you gave testimony about how many repeat visits  
3 there were.

4 **A** Yeah. I don't -- I can tell from the data set, but I  
5 never bothered to look at it.

6 **Q** Here was your slide. "Patients with a prior fill at  
7 Walmart stores."

8 You have looked at patients who had prior fills at the  
9 stores, right?

10 **A** Yes, I did.

11 **Q** You also looked at prescribers who had been repeat  
12 prescribers, didn't you?

13 **A** I did, yes.

14 **Q** So to put this into context, my question to you is,  
15 did you happen to run a check to see who the top five  
16 prescribers were getting their prescriptions filled at  
17 Walmart?

18 **A** I did not run that analysis.

19 **Q** That might be important if we're going to decide if  
20 their slice of the pie has a significant impact on the  
21 community, true?

22 **A** I don't know. I don't know how to evaluate that.

23 **Q** Assume with me that Dr. Demangone had 148,000-plus  
24 dosage units, more than the next four prescribers combined.

25 Did you take that into account?

1                   MS. FUMERTON: Objection. Assumes facts not  
2 in evidence.

3                   THE COURT: Overruled.

4       **A**     I did not take that into account.

5       **Q**     And before we leave the statistic illusion area, a  
6 couple of things I'd like to talk to you about.

7                   Let's start with your confidence intervals you ended  
8 with. You manufactured these, didn't you?

9       **A**     When you say "manufactured," what do you mean by that?

10      **Q**     I mean, you made this slide, didn't you?

11      **A**     Yeah.

12      **Q**     And you're the one who dispersed these dots and  
13 circles in a nonrandom pattern, aren't you?

14      **A**     I did.

15      **Q**     You specifically, yourself, took random out of this  
16 equation at the very start, didn't you?

17      **A**     To be clear, this is illustrating why the method that  
18 Dr. McCann used has problems.

19      **Q**     With due respect, sir, please focus on my questions.  
20 We're going to get to his method in a moment.

21                   This is your creature though, isn't it?

22      **A**     I did create this example.

23      **Q**     Yes. And you're the one who divided the slices up so  
24 unequally, aren't you?

25      **A**     Yes, I did.

1           Q     Because you could even take your island, as you've  
2     done it, and what do we need, we need five in each one? So  
3     we could go and do an island there, we could go and do an  
4     island there, we could go and do an island there, and we  
5     could go and do an island there, couldn't we?

6       **A**     So you have to understand that statistics is the -- is  
7              in the business of making conservative assumptions. If you  
8              end up picking an example where you divide the regions where  
9              all the circles and dots are equally divided, you're the  
10             one, sir, who is actually making the illusion because we  
11             don't know things are going to divide up so evenly.

12 Q Well, we don't know things are going to divide up so  
13 unevenly either, where you have a line drawn here and you  
14 have three little pieces and you have a big chunk where you  
15 isolated all.

16      **A**        But the right way to respond -- the right way to  
17                   analyze the data is --

18      8 You've got to wait till I finish the question.

19 THE COURT: Hold it. Let's have a question  
20 and an answer.

21 Q You've got to wait until I finish the question.

22      **A**           My apologies.

23 Q That's okay. This is not speed chess. You can't  
24 pre-move, all right?

25 You have to -- you are the one who selected three

1 small chunks, one big chunk, and you drew the lines where  
2 you would set up the result, didn't you?

3 **A** I did, as an illustration.

4 **Q** As an illustration, you have used what is classically  
5 called post hoc analysis, haven't you?

6 **A** I don't -- I mean, in my world that's not post hoc  
7 analysis, so I'm not comfortable attaching that name to it.

8 **Q** All right. Well, we'll stay in your world.

9 Your pieces don't all turn out to be the same size, do  
10 they?

11 **A** They sure don't, no.

12 **Q** And your pieces were hand selected by you to get your  
13 result, weren't they?

14 **A** They absolutely were as an illustration for what can  
15 go wrong.

16 **Q** And if you go back and you look at what Dr. McCann did  
17 and the funneling process, you understand Dr. McCann did not  
18 choose any of those prescriptions that were needed to run  
19 the red flags?

20 MS. FUMERTON: Objection, Your Honor. This  
21 was not in his report, and he wasn't --

22 THE COURT: Overruled.

23 **A** I've never seen this before.

24 **Q** This is his testimony in this case.

25 MR. DELINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.

1                   MR. LANIER: No, this is -- I'll fix it, Your  
2 Honor.

3                   MS. FUMERTON: Your Honor, can we go on the  
4 headsets?

5                   THE COURT: Let's go on the headphones for a  
6 minute.

7                   (At side bar at 11:29 a.m.)

8                   THE COURT: You can make this point but not  
9 the way you're making it. Okay? You can bring that, you  
10 know, McCann didn't preselect the 2,000 or the 4,000,  
11 whatever it was. Okay?

12                  MR. LANIER: Got it. Thank you, Judge.

13                  MS. FUMERTON: Your Honor, we object to the  
14 chart being shown.

15                  THE COURT: All right, fine, but he can make  
16 the point otherwise.

17                  (In open court at 11:30 a.m.)

18 BY MR. LANIER:

19 Q        You understand Dr. McCann did not pick, hand pick  
20 these prescriptions. They were randomly generated.

21        Do you understand that?

22 A        The years were not randomly generated. The years are  
23 what they are. The division was by years.

24 Q        Right.

25 A        So he ended up taking the original data set of

1 prescriptions, and they were divided by years. And no one  
2 had any control over how many prescriptions were in each of  
3 those years.

4 **Q** That's exactly right. It was not hand picked.

5 And in terms of the years itself, do you think that  
6 that was Dr. McCann or the Court that made that decision?

7 **A** I don't know who made that decision, but the formulas  
8 are not consistent with that process of first dividing by  
9 years and then drawing random samples from them.

10 Those formulas are not appropriate. As a statistician  
11 I would say that those are not the right formulas to use to  
12 extrapolate back to the population. There are formulas that  
13 exist, but he didn't use them.

14 **Q** Well, let's just say -- well, you're assuming that was  
15 his responsibility. You're putting it at his feet.

16 **A** Well, in his second report he wrote out the confidence  
17 interval formulas, and they don't apply to the data as it's  
18 sampled.

19 **Q** So you say. And your illustration is one where you  
20 don't divide it even evenly, do you?

21 **A** There's a very basic idea in statistical sampling  
22 called --

23 **Q** Answer my question.

24 MS. FUMERTON: Your Honor, let him --

25 THE COURT: Hold it.

1           You can answer Mr. Lanier's question.

2   **A**     Could you repeat your question, please?

3   **Q**     Yes, sir. You did not divide your sections equally in  
4       your illustration, did you?

5   **A**     In my illustration I didn't because I don't think that  
6       would have made the point where things could go wrong.

7   **Q**     Dosage units, you weren't quite there with the jury on  
8       that, were you?

9   **A**     Could you be more specific?

10   **Q**     Yes, sir. I'm showing you Plaintiffs' Demo 123. I'm  
11       sure you've seen this before because you looked at  
12       Dr. McCann's charts, right, and his report?

13   **A**     This looks vaguely familiar, but I don't remember when  
14       I last looked at it.

15   **Q**     This is time: 2008 to 2018.

16       Do you see that 10-year period, 11-year period?

17   **A**     Yes.

18   **Q**     This is putting up those opiates.

19       Do you see that as well?

20   **A**     Which data set is this from?

21   **Q**     This is the data set that he looked at that came from  
22       OARRS. In other words, this is dispensing data. This is  
23       how much they actually dispensed. You got it?

24   **A**     Okay.

25   **Q**     And if you look at the total dosage units instead of

1 the MMEs you've used, you will see that Walmart, 6.8 percent  
2 with 16 million-plus dosage units.

3 | Do you see that?

4      **A**       I do see that number, yes.

5           **Q**       And some years it was higher. You've got 2014 they're  
6 at 7.3 percent; 2015, 7.8; 2017, 9.8.

7 Those are statistics you didn't show to the jury,  
8 aren't they?

9 MS. FUMERTON: Your Honor, objection.

10 Could we be heard on the headset, please?

11 | THE COURT: Overruled.

12 MS. FUMERTON: Well, Your Honor, this chart  
13 has not been shown before.

14 | THE COURT: Overruled.

15 MS. FUMERTON: Could I please be heard?

16 THE COURT: Overruled.

17 BY MR. LANIER:

18 Q Another issue, sir, while we're on this stop. You  
19 told the jury, "Most patients are acute pain less than six  
20 weeks in a given year."

21 Do you see that?

22      **A**           Yes, I do.

23 Q You didn't look and put up here the statistics of the  
24 flagged prescriptions to see how many of those were acute or  
25 chronic, did you?

1       **A**     In this pie chart I didn't, but the table it contains  
2 has the answer, right.

3       **Q**     Right. So the visual you gave the jury makes it look  
4 like the majority of Walmart patients were dispensed opioids  
5 for acute pain. But you did have the data of chronic pain,  
6 didn't you?

7       **A**     Yeah. I wasn't hiding it. It was on the table.

8       **Q**     Patients with flagged prescriptions, acute drops down  
9 to 50 percent, doesn't it?

10      **A**     Yes, it does.

11      **Q**     And supply days, over 42 supply days, that's half of  
12 the patients being dispensed from Walmart, true?

13      **A**     It's one minus the percent of -- 100 percent minus the  
14 percent that were acute patients.

15      **Q**     That would redraw that chart almost in half, wouldn't  
16 it?

17      **A**     If we were to produce a pie chart for that row of the  
18 table, that's what it would look like, yes.

19      **Q**     All right. Let's go to the last stop, please, on the  
20 road. And this stop I've called reality. And this is where  
21 I'd like to look at some of your slides.

22                  Let's start with your idea of 25 miles to the  
23 Cleveland Clinic.

24                  Remember that testimony?

25      **A**     I do, yes.

1       **Q**       Now, you offered a slide where you showed the  
2 prescriber postal code in the Cleveland Clinic area. True?

3       **A**       I did not show this today, no.

4       **Q**       Okay. And we're -- but you prepared this slide,  
5 didn't you?

6       **A**       I did, yes.

7       **Q**       By the way, you understand the Cleveland Clinic  
8 actually has facilities in a number of different places?

9       **A**       I'm not specifically aware of that, but I can believe  
10 that, yes.

11      **Q**       Including in some of the county locations we've talked  
12 about?

13      **A**       Right, but the flag is actually based on ZIP codes.  
14 So wherever the Cleveland Clinic itself, specific clinic,  
15 would be indicated by the ZIP code.

16      **Q**       Well, I believe, I could be wrong, but I believe the  
17 Cleveland Clinic within Cleveland, that campus may have its  
18 own ZIP code. Did you know that?

19      **A**       I believe that's correct, yes.

20      **Q**       But within the framework of that, sir, you didn't  
21 check the other Cleveland Clinics, did you?

22      **A**       The analysis that I did wasn't specific to the  
23 Cleveland Clinic. I was making an argument for how things  
24 could be a problem if you happen to live outside the 25-mile  
25 radius of the Cleveland Clinic --

1       **Q**     But look at the statistics. There were 1800 hard  
2     copies of prescriptions looked at by Mr. Catizone, right?

3       **A**     I don't remember that number.

4       **Q**     Did you do the math to see that of the red-flagged  
5     prescriptions, only 135, or 7.5 percent, were written at the  
6     Cleveland Clinic?

7              Did you know that?

8       **A**     I didn't perform these computations, and I'm not aware  
9     if these numbers are correct.

10      **Q**     And if you further then, I'm assuming, did not perform  
11     the computation for the jury of how many of those would be  
12     flagged for distance of over 25 miles, you're down to 26  
13     prescriptions out of 1800, or 1.4 percent, are even in play.

14              Did you know that?

15                          MS. FUMERTON: Objection, Your Honor.

16                          THE COURT: Overruled.

17      **A**     I didn't perform these computations, so I can't verify  
18     what you're saying is correct.

19      **Q**     But before you come in here and criticize Mr. Catizone  
20     for his red flags -- and by the way, I'm a big Cleveland  
21     Clinic fan. I think everybody in the community is. But  
22     understand, sir, that that doesn't mean that they're  
23     absolutely perfect. Fair?

24      **A**     No clinic is.

25      **Q**     And it never hurts for anyone to at least have someone

1        eyeball it, and they'll probably say, Cleveland Clinic, make  
2        a note, it's okay. But it doesn't hurt to eyeball it just  
3        in case, does it?

4        **A**        Much in the way that Dr. McCann should have been  
5        eyeballing the results in his analysis, right?

6        **Q**        I'm sorry, sir, you're taking a potshot at Dr. McCann  
7        instead of answering my question.

8                    MS. FUMERTON: Objection.

9                    THE COURT: Overruled.

10        **Q**        Answer my question.

11        **A**        No, I'm not taking a potshot. I'm just making the  
12        argument that if somebody is claiming to not be doing some  
13        analyses that wasn't in the scope of their work, you know, I  
14        would say the same thing for Dr. McCann.

15        **Q**        Can you now answer my question --

16        **A**        Sure. Ask it again please.

17        **Q**        -- and then I'll rise to Dr. McCann's defense. First  
18        answer my question.

19                    It doesn't hurt to eyeball the prescription just in  
20        case, does it?

21        **A**        It doesn't hurt to eyeball the prescription?

22        **Q**        Yeah. If a prescription is flagged, it doesn't hurt  
23        to look at it just to make sure, ah, that's Cleveland  
24        Clinic, okay, I understand. Doesn't hurt to do that, does  
25        it?

1       **A**      Depends what analysis you're performing.

2       **Q**      Well, I'm sure that someone could go into the  
3                   Cleveland Clinic back 15 years ago before people were  
4                   more -- as careful as they are now and electronic as they  
5                   are now, and grab a prescription pad.

6                   It never hurts to check to make sure a prescription's  
7                   valid, does it?

8       **A**      Again, this is outside the scope of the kinds of  
9                   analysis that I would be doing.

10      **Q**      All right.

11      **A**      So I can't really opine on that.

12      **Q**      Did you do the analysis to see the top five doctors  
13                   that were flagged by the 25 miles?

14      **A**      No, I did not.

15      **Q**      If you had done the analysis to -- I'm showing Demo  
16                   121.

17                   If you had done the analysis to look at Walmart's  
18                   dispensing data for the top 5 that triggered flag 2, you'd  
19                   have seen these doctors. The jury's heard about  
20                   Dr. Demangone. Bruce Piszel, 662 prescriptions flagged flag  
21                   2.

22                   Do you know who Dr. Piszel is?

23      **A**      I don't, no.

24      **Q**      I say Dr. Piszel, I don't think that's right anymore.  
25                   He surrendered his license over this. Do you know that?

1       **A**      I didn't.

2                   MS. FUMERTON: Objection.

3                   THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained.

4       **Q**      You don't know about these other doctors either,  
5                   Dr. Moufawad, for example?

6       **A**      I don't, no.

7                   MS. FUMERTON: Objection to the entire exhibit  
8                   when there's no facts in evidence on this.

9                   THE COURT: Mr. Lanier, the witness said he  
10                  doesn't know any of the doctors.

11                  MR. LANIER: All right. I'll move on, Judge.

12       **Q**      Next, you put a slide up that quoted the DEA's  
13                  testimony from Mr. Wright that said 80/20 is a ratio that's  
14                  looked at, right?

15       **A**      Yes, I did.

16       **Q**      I want you to assume with me that the jury has heard  
17                  testimony from Joe Rannazzisi on this point, okay?

18       **A**      Okay.

19       **Q**      And I want you to assume with me that Joe Rannazzisi  
20                  said that the 80/20 percentages, quote, was not the end-all.  
21                  You could have a pharmacy that has a smaller percentage of  
22                  opioid, a larger percentage of opioid to noncontrolled drug  
23                  purchases or dispensing, and that pharmacy might be fine.  
24                  But you could also have a pharmacy that has a very small  
25                  percentage, 12 percent, but when you look at their opioids,

1 every opiate going out the door is an oxycodone 30 milligram  
2 tablet. He said that doesn't make any sense.

3 You didn't take into account that concept when you  
4 spoke to the jury of the 80/20 rule, fair?

5 **A** I did not. I was using the information that was given  
6 by Kyle Wright's testimony. And had I had others, I could  
7 have compared it to those numbers.

8 **Q** Well, if you will assume with me that Joe Rannazzisi  
9 was running the Diversion unit for the DEA at one point in  
10 his career and that he said that while this is an indicator,  
11 it's not necessarily the end-all and, quote, "You can't say,  
12 well, if it's less than 20 we don't have to worry about it,  
13 because that's not how the system should be set up."

14 If you take that testimony from a DEA man into  
15 account, kind of changes your slides on that in the real  
16 world, doesn't it?

17 MS. FUMERTON: Objection, Your Honor.

18 **A** It doesn't change my slides in the sense that I was  
19 doing --

20 THE COURT: Overruled. You can answer.

21 **A** It doesn't change my slides in the sense that I was  
22 performing a computation to compare the controlled substance  
23 rate at these Walmart pharmacies to a stated guideline, and  
24 I wasn't making any judgments on that.

25 **Q** But you never gave the jury a good readout of how much

1 hydrocodone the Walmart stores were selling, did you?

2 MS. FUMERTON: Objection.

3 THE COURT: Sustained.

4 **Q** Sir, did you -- I'm handing you Demonstrative Exhibit  
5 87.

6 Do you have that in front of you?

7 **A** Yes, I do now, yeah.

8 **Q** And it is for the years 2006 to 2018, the Walmart  
9 dispensing data-total dosage units of hydrocodone dispensed.

10 Do you see that?

11 **A** Yes, I see this chart you gave me.

12 **Q** You've got over 8 1/2 million units during that time  
13 period.

14 Do you see that?

15 MS. FUMERTON: Objection. Foundation.

16 THE COURT: Overruled.

17 **A** I see the number. What's your question?

18 **Q** Did you take that into account at all in the figures  
19 you gave this jury about how much drug was being sold by  
20 these companies -- or by Walmart stores?

21 **A** I have dosage units reported in my tables for  
22 2006-2014.

23 **Q** You stopped at '14?

24 MS. FUMERTON: Objection.

25 **Q** Is that what I'm hearing?

1       **A**     For -- based on the CT III Walmart -- oh, the  
2 dispensing data, I'm sorry. Okay.

3       **Q**     Did you even use the dispensing data?

4       **A**     Yeah, of course I used the dispensing data.

5       **Q**     And did you stop at 2014?

6       **A**     No, for the dispensing data I stopped at 2018 for all  
7 the analyses that you saw.

8       **Q**     And did you isolate out hydrocodone for the jury?

9       **A**     I don't recall off the top of my head if one of my  
10 slides went through hydrocodone.

11      **Q**     Instead you put slides like slide 19 up in front of  
12 the jury. This was your slide, correct?

13      **A**     Yes.

14      **Q**     Let me back it out so you can read my notes, because  
15 these are my questions.

16            You've ignored dosage units here, haven't you?

17      **A**     Ignored dosage units? This is a table that summarizes  
18 prescriptions, not dosage units, not MMEs.

19      **Q**     In other words, you've ignored dosage units, haven't  
20 you?

21      **A**     I didn't ignore them. I just simply didn't present  
22 them.

23      **Q**     Well, you know that a prescription for 30 pills is  
24 different than a prescription for 120 pills, don't you?

25      **A**     Sure.

1       **Q**     Which is different than a prescription larger than  
2     that or smaller than that.

3                      Prescriptions aren't going to tell you how many pills  
4     per person were put out, are they?

5       **A**     Yeah, and that's not what this table claims to  
6     purport. So it's not trying to hide anything. It's just  
7     telling you if you want to be thinking in terms of  
8     prescriptions and prescriptions per capita, that's what this  
9     table is showing.

10      **Q**     But you don't break out pills per capita to see how  
11     many pills are out there, do you?

12      **A**     In this analysis I do not.

13      **Q**     And did you see that analysis that's been done by  
14     others in this case?

15                      MS. FUMERTON: Objection.

16                      THE COURT: Yeah, sustained.

17      **Q**     Okay. Have you seen that analysis -- well, let me ask  
18     it this way.

19                      Did you perform that analysis?

20      **A**     Did I perform which analysis?

21      **Q**     How many pills per person in these counties were put  
22     out by Walmart during the years that you had the dispensing  
23     data?

24                      MS. FUMERTON: Objection.

25                      THE COURT: Overruled.

1 | **A** I did not.

2 Q Now, a lot of your charts that you put up were charts  
3 that were based on MME.

4 | Remember that?

5 | **A** I do, yes.

6      10      You selected MME in these charts, didn't you?

**A** That's correct, yes.

8       Q       Now, the jury was shown and heard testimony yesterday  
9              from Mr. Choi, who is -- Dr. Choi, I guess, maybe's a  
10          doctor, who's an economist.

11 | Did you read his report?

12      **A**           No, I did not.

13 Q I want you to assume with me that he said that the  
14 median total, and that's median, not mean, the median total  
15 for MME per prescription by pharmacy in these counties,  
16 taking into account that time span, puts Walmart down here  
17 in the lower MME range.

18 Do you see that?

19 | **A** Okay, yeah.

20 Q And the low MME range, you know that's where you're  
21 going to find drugs like hydrocodone and oxycodone, right?

22 | A Okay.

23 Q The fentanyl popsicles, they're going to be up at the  
24 high range, aren't they?

25 MS. FUMERTON: Objection.

1                   THE COURT: I'm going to sustain it. If you  
2 want to ask the witness if he knows anything about this, you  
3 can. If he does, fine. If he doesn't --

4                   MR. LANIER: Judge, I'll move on.

5                   THE COURT: Okay.

6                   MR. LANIER: I'll move on.

7   **Q**       This same thing you've done over and over, you have  
8 used MMES instead of dosage units, haven't you?

9   **A**       I have, yes.

10   **Q**       All right. So with that reality picture, we're at the  
11 end of the road.

12                  MR. LANIER: Your Honor, I'll pass the  
13 witness.

14                  THE COURT: Okay. I think this is what we'll  
15 do. Ladies and gentlemen, if you want to pass any questions  
16 that you might have for this witness to Mr. Pitts. And I  
17 think in honor of the birthday we'll give you a little  
18 longer lunch, we'll look at the questions, and we'll pick up  
19 with further testimony of this witness at 1:00.

20                  So have a good lunch.

21                  (The jury is not present.)

22                  (Juror question review.)

23                  (A luncheon recess was taken at 11:50 a.m.)

24

25

## 1                   A F T E R N O O N   S E S S I O N

2                   - - - - -

3                   (In open court at 1:11 p.m.)

4                   THE COURT: The plaintiffs have proposed an  
5 instruction. I'm not inclined to give it. If I give an  
6 instruction, I can't just tell the jury what they can't  
7 consider the statements for. I have to tell them what they  
8 can consider it for, like I've done in what we have in the  
9 proposed final instructions on settlements.

10                  So I have to come up with language for that. And I'm  
11 not exactly sure what I would say, and I think it draws more  
12 attention to the statements and may be confusing.

13                  So unless the parties agree on something, like they  
14 have on settlements, I'm not inclined to give anything.

15                  MR. MAJORAS: Thank you, Your Honor.

16                  MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor --

17                  THE COURT: This doesn't come out on the  
18 realtime.

19                  MR. WEINBERGER: I think you got it now.

20                  THE COURT: All right. Go ahead,  
21 Mr. Weinberger.

22                  MR. WEINBERGER: So when we went through our  
23 issues with the Mack testimony, you said to suggest a  
24 limiting instruction, which is what I came up with.

25                  THE COURT: I understand. But I'm not just --

1 I'm not going to say you can't consider it for the truth of  
2 the matter. I've got to say what you can consider it for.

3 MR. WEINBERGER: I understand that, Your  
4 Honor. But I don't think that it's fair to the plaintiff  
5 that we have to submit something that the defendants are  
6 going to agree to or else you're not going to give a  
7 limiting instruction at all.

8 THE COURT: Well, I didn't quite say that, but  
9 you've got to suggest to me what they can take it for. I'm  
10 not going to -- I mean, akin to the instruction that we have  
11 on settlements. It says it's in for a limited purpose, and  
12 it says what the limited purpose is.

13 MR. WEINBERGER: I'll try to come up with  
14 something. That's part of the problem that I have. I can't  
15 fathom what they should consider hearsay for.

16 MR. MAJORAS: Your Honor, John Majoras.

17 Just for the record, we object to a limiting  
18 instruction at all on this witness. I think it unfairly  
19 points to her testimony as though it's somehow less  
20 trustworthy or should be treated differently than others.

21 The Court need not and does not explain its rationale  
22 for its evidentiary rulings. It should not be doing that  
23 now. It's not Evidence 101 for the jury.

24 And then finally, if the Court, and you may already  
25 have this in your final instructions, if the Court has a

1 general instruction of the jury should not try to -- should  
2 not take my rulings one way or the other on evidentiary  
3 issues and should only pay attention to the evidence that's  
4 been submitted and to not pay attention to those you're  
5 specifically instructed, that's all there should be.

6 This opens up the Court to, you know, questions on a  
7 regular basis, "Why are you ruling this way." That's not  
8 really the jury's province.

9 And of course, in this --

10 THE COURT: I would not limit it just to  
11 Ms. Mack, of course it goes to other witnesses. And if I  
12 give a limiting instruction, Mr. Weinberger, I have to  
13 instruct the jury what is the limited purpose for which they  
14 may consider the testimony --

15 MR. MAJORAS: Your Honor -- I'm sorry.

16 THE COURT: -- which is the purpose of a  
17 limiting instruction, Mr. Majoras. It's not -- if the Court  
18 allows evidence for a limited purpose, it is appropriate and  
19 I think essential for the Judge to say, all right, you can't  
20 consider it for this purpose but you may consider it for  
21 this purpose. That's the whole point.

22 MR. MAJORAS: I understand, sir.

23 THE COURT: Like we did for settlements.

24 So the question is whether I should give one. And if  
25 I give one, I'm going to have to tell them what they may

1 consider it for.

2 MR. MAJORAS: The issue here, sir, is it's not  
3 hearsay, as you've ruled, because it's not being offered for  
4 the truth of the matter asserted.

5 THE COURT: That's the point. If the  
6 non-hearsay -- it is hearsay if she relates, you know, what  
7 someone said, an out-of-court statement by someone else is  
8 hearsay.

9 Now, the witness can testify that I had that -- I had  
10 a conversation with someone, identify it, and as a result of  
11 that conversation I did something or I didn't do something.  
12 And that's the non-hearsay -- that's the non-hearsay use of  
13 the statement. It goes to knowledge, intent, state of mind  
14 of the defendant. Okay?

15 MR. MAJORAS: I agree, Your Honor, which has  
16 been the case with other --

17 THE COURT: Which is what we say about the  
18 settlement agreements.

19 MR. MAJORAS: Which is and part of my issue,  
20 Your Honor, is if there should be a discussion about what  
21 hearsay may or may not be, it should be at the end of the  
22 case, if at all, because these hearsay rulings have applied  
23 to virtually every witness in the case.

24 THE COURT: Well, I'd like the parties to  
25 consider, maybe the logical thing is to put it in, if I do

1       it, I'll put it in the final instruction as part of that.

2       All right?

3                    MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, this is a

4       critical issue in this case, and to --

5                    THE COURT: We've already had testimony --

6                    MR. WEINBERGER: And to lose it, you know,

7       within the Court's general instructions just does not --

8                    THE COURT: Mr. Weinberger, I'm not going to  
9       give this instruction.

10                  MR. WEINBERGER: I have a different proposal.

11                  THE COURT: All right. What's your proposal?

12                  MR. WEINBERGER: "This testimony is not to be  
13       considered for the truth of what was said to Ms. Mack. It  
14       is only to be considered as her reason for taking certain  
15       action without regard to its truth."

16                  MR. MAJORAS: That's well beyond the ruling of  
17       the Court. It specifically does what I'm concerned about,  
18       is singling out a particular witness.

19                  THE COURT: If I would say anything, it's you  
20       may consider if for the fact that it was said to her. But  
21       the problem is that sounds like the truth of it --

22                  MR. WEINBERGER: Right.

23                  THE COURT: -- as well. So that's why -- at  
24       the moment I'm not going to say anything.

25                  MR. MAJORAS: And, Your Honor, if there's a

1 proposal in terms of the final instructions about  
2 evidentiary rulings, we're of course happy to look at it.  
3 That would at least address my concern that it seems  
4 directed to a particular witness.

5 THE COURT: Well, right. And it would go  
6 beyond this witness because we've had testimony with other  
7 ones, and that's the other thing. I'm not going to direct  
8 it to this witness without the others. It doesn't make  
9 sense.

10 So the parties can -- and I'm going to think about  
11 adding something to the instruction that's now on -- it's on  
12 page 22, settlement agreements, because that says what -- it  
13 says the evidence has been admitted for a limited purpose.

14 So it seems to me that's the place to put it, because  
15 it came in with more than one witness.

16 MR. WEINBERGER: We'll craft something, Your  
17 Honor.

18 THE COURT: And show it to the defendants. To  
19 me, that's the logical place.

20 MR. MAJORAS: We will work with the  
21 plaintiffs, Your Honor, on language to see what's  
22 appropriate.

23 With that, Your Honor, I'm going to take my leave.  
24 Thank you.

25 THE COURT: All right. I hope everything

1 goes -- I know it will go well. You have our  
2 congratulations.

3 MR. MAJORAS: Thank you, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Okay. We can bring the jury in  
5 then.

6 | (The jury is present at 1:20 p.m.)

7 THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated.

8 Dr. Glickman, you're still under oath from this  
9 morning.

10 And Ms. Fumerton, you may continue, please.

11 MS. FUMERTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

12 And I guess good afternoon now, Dr. Glickman.

13 | -----

14 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION

15 BY MS. FUMERTON:

16 Q So the jury has the opportunity to ask certain  
17 questions, and so I'm going to display those now for you to  
18 answer. And what I would ask, though, is that you, again,  
19 answer them to sort of the best of your ability within your  
20 expertise. And if it's outside of your expertise, it's  
21 perfectly okay to say it's not part of your expertise. Or  
22 especially if it is part of your expertise but it's just  
23 something you didn't analyze and would need more data,  
24 that's fine to answer too.

25 A Okay.

1       **Q**      This last one last, can you read that okay?

2       **A**      Should I try reading it out loud?

3       **Q**      No. I'll try to read it, and then you can answer.

4                 "Example: If you look at three years of data, three  
5                 people overdose one year; second year, four overdose, and  
6                 then there's five overdoses in year three, the total, 12  
7                 overdoses" -- or "that totals 12 overdoses" -- following so  
8                 far? "The means number would be 4, correct?"

9       **A**      Yeah. So it looks like if you're averaging three and  
10         four and five in these three consecutive years, then it  
11         would be an average of four per year. So I believe that's  
12         correct.

13       **Q**      Okay. And then the last statement was, "That hides  
14         the fact that 12 people overdosed is hidden."

15                 Do you agree with that statement?

16       **A**      I'm not sure I agree with that, because if you know  
17         that there are four -- if there are four per year and it's  
18         over three years, then you can determine that three times  
19         four is 12.

20                 Now, you don't exactly know how -- you know, if you  
21         just knew that it was four per year, you don't know how  
22         those 12 distribute across the three years. Like, you don't  
23         know it's three, four, five, or you don't know it's four,  
24         four, four. But the average of four tells you at least that  
25         on average across those three years it's four per year.

1       **Q**       And I just want to tie this back to your testimony  
2                  today.

3                  I don't remember seeing any means or averages within  
4                  what you testified today. Is that correct?

5       **A**       Yeah. I have to say I'm not exactly sure what that's  
6                  connecting to. If we had a little bit more reference for  
7                  that question, I might be able to address that more  
8                  specifically.

9       **Q**       And unfortunately, we don't get to ask the jury sort  
10                 of follow-up questions with that, so we do the best we can.

11                 But you also didn't talk about any deaths anywhere in  
12                 any of your --

13       **A**       I'm sorry?

14       **Q**       Any deaths?

15       **A**       Any deaths, no, I certainly didn't refer to deaths in  
16                 particular, no.

17       **Q**       Next question. "You did not generate or review the  
18                 exact prescriptions that Dr. McCann or Mr. Catizone  
19                 reviewed?"

20                 Is that accurate?

21       **A**       The way I'm understanding the question, "Did not  
22                 generate or review the exact prescriptions..."

23                 Oh, from ...

24       **Q**       Maybe I can help out with this question --

25       **A**       Yeah, I'm not sure I understand.

1       **Q**       -- because I think I understand what the juror is  
2       asking.

3                     Did you review the same data set that Dr. McCann did?

4       **A**       Yeah. I mean, I analyzed the same data set as what  
5       Dr. McCann used. I mean, in terms of -- I mean, the  
6       generating question I guess is more related to the  
7       generating the sample of 1800. That's what -- I guess, like  
8       the only time I think I used the word "generate" was in  
9       relation to the sample of 1800.

10      **Q**       But the sample of the 1800, if that's what the  
11       question is going to, was the same 1800 that Dr. McCann  
12       reviewed and Mr. Catizone reviewed, correct?

13      **A**       Yeah, that's my understanding; that once they  
14       generated the 1800 prescriptions, which were a sample from  
15       the total of 49,243, that Dr. McCann flagged, I think at  
16       that point those 1800 were then reviewed by plaintiff. I'm  
17       not exactly sure who reviewed them, but yes.

18      **Q**       And just as a follow-up question on that, are the five  
19       Walmart stores that you analyzed the same five that  
20       Dr. McCann was analyzing?

21      **A**       Yes, they were.

22      **Q**       And did Dr. McCann analyze any other pharmacies  
23       outside of Lake and Trumbull County, Walmart or otherwise?  
24       Mr. Lanier was asking you questions about stores in  
25       Pennsylvania.

1       **A**     Not that I'm aware of.

2       **Q**     And in fact, when we were talking about the market  
3           share numbers earlier, we walked through that we were -- you  
4           were actually using the charts prepared by Dr. McCann to  
5           come up with the numbers; is that fair?

6       **A**     I was, yes.

7       **Q**     Okay. Several parts to this question, so we're going  
8           to try to walk through this together. And I tried to pull  
9           the charts.

10      **A**     Okay.

11      **Q**     It says, "85,087 was the total number of oxycodone  
12           dispensed by Walmart between 2006 and/or 2018?"

13           And so I think what the juror was asking was about  
14           this chart that we showed. And I actually wrote on this  
15           one, so I'm showing the exact same one that's not marked up.  
16           Maybe you folks can see it a little bit better.

17           So this is 1536, and that's the same one that's here.  
18           So I'm just going to use this one so we can focus on it for  
19           the juror question.

20      **A**     Okay.

21      **Q**     Okay. So if we could keep the juror question on here  
22           too.

23           So it looks like the number that the juror is asking  
24           about is this one right here.

25      **A**     Okay.

1       **Q**       And so can you just explain what that number is?

2       **A**       Yeah. That's the total number of prescriptions of  
3                   oxycodone in Lake and Trumbull County between 2006 and the  
4                   end of March of 2018.

5       **Q**       And that's for Walmart?

6       **A**       That's for Walmart specifically, yes.

7       **Q**       So next question.

8                   MR. LANIER: Can you move the question?

9                   MS. FUMERTON: Yeah, thank you. I'm trying  
10                  to --

11                  THE WITNESS: If you can move it to the left a  
12                  little bit.

13       **Q**       Here. We'll do this. Just trying to let you see the  
14                  question and the chart at the same time.

15                  Okay. So the second question was, "How many pills, on  
16                  average, is in a prescription?"

17       **A**       Yeah, that's something I don't know the answer to.  
18                  That, I can't answer.

19       **Q**       And I think this reference 01536 is just that we're  
20                  all looking at the same chart.

21                  All right. "So if seven pills were in 85,087  
22                  prescriptions, that equals what?"

23       **A**       Are we asking what's the fraction of 7 -- oh, I see.  
24                  So if there were --

25       **Q**       I'm going to put all three of these because perhaps

1       that will help. And I think this is just about this number,  
2       so I'm going to cover this up for a second.

3           So the rest of the --

4       **A**      Oh, I see. So if there were seven pills per  
5       prescription, that's how I'm understanding it, so --

6       **Q**      I think that's right.

7           So if you're saying "If there's 85,087 prescriptions,  
8       that equals how many pills," is how I'm reading it.

9       **A**      So, I mean, to answer -- thank you.

10          To answer the question, it would be the multiplication  
11       of 85,087 times 7. So that number, just using my fancy  
12       phone calculator, is going to --

13          I'm allowed to do this, right? I guess the answer is  
14       yes.

15          85,087 times 7, that gives me a total of 595,609  
16       pills.

17       **Q**      And of course, we don't know what the answer is to how  
18       many pills are per prescription. It could be three in a  
19       prescription or --

20       **A**      Yeah, I'm understanding this question as hypothetical.

21       **Q**      Okay. And then divide that number, which what was the  
22       number that we just said?

23       **A**      By the total number of people in both counties.

24       **Q**      Right, both counties. And I don't know if that number  
25       is here on this chart or if you would need --

1       **A**     No, it is. It's that 439,668.

2       **Q**     Got it.

3       **A**     So if I divide the 595,609 divided by 439,668, so that  
4     gives me the number 1.355.

5       **Q**     I'm sorry, 1.355?

6       **A**     Yeah, 1.355.

7       **Q**     Okay. And then the next question is, "What is the  
8     actual percentage of pills filled by Walmart in Lake and  
9     Trumbull County as a percentage?" And there's a comment,  
10    "If this is the right formula, please compare that total  
11    percentage to the totals on the exhibit."

12           So I think you could -- let me ask this in two ways.  
13    You could finish this hypothetical, right, and you could  
14    come up with a percentage?

15       **A**     Right.

16       **Q**     Do you know what -- but you would need more  
17     information that's on that chart; is that right?

18       **A**     So, could you -- can we look at the question one more  
19     time? I'll have one more comment about this in a moment,  
20     but what is the actual percent pills filled by Walmart, the  
21     actual percentage of pills --

22       **Q**     And so --

23       **A**     I'm not sure I have that information here.

24       **Q**     Yeah, I don't know if that's -- but I did want to  
25     point out because I think this information might be on this

1 chart.

2 So tell me, it's slightly different, but this is  
3 something that you looked at -- or we looked at earlier, and  
4 this is MDL 01541A. And we looked at it just in the  
5 presentation, but it's the same that we looked at before.

6 I think the question is about pills. So can you tell  
7 anything about what the percentage of Walmart pills were  
8 dispensed in this county based on this chart?

9 **A** Yeah. So the dosage units are basically counting the  
10 pills because an individual dosage unit is typically an  
11 individual pill, but it could be other things.

12 So as a rough approximation, if you take the total  
13 Walmart dosage units, which looks like it's 10,380,575, you  
14 can in theory take that number, divide it by the population  
15 total, which was on the other chart, and then get a number.

16 **Q** And that would give you a per population or per  
17 individual number. But if you were looking to what the  
18 percentage of pills filled by Walmart in Lake and Trumbull  
19 County is, we were talking earlier about this 3.15 percent  
20 number, which is the percentage of Walmart's share of the  
21 opioids by MME.

22 **A** Right.

23 **Q** What is on your chart --

24 **A** Right, so the percentage of the shared -- the  
25 percentage share of dosage units is the 4.71 percent.

1       **Q**       So that information is contained on your chart as  
2 well?

3       **A**       That is on my chart, that's right.

4                  And in that case, you don't have to make the  
5 assumption that there are seven pills or any specific number  
6 of pills per -- you know, per prescription.

7       **Q**       And I just want to look at the source here. The  
8 source is the expert report of Craig McCann, Ph.D., with  
9 backup materials.

10                 And so again, these are the numbers that Dr. McCann's  
11 using, right?

12       **A**       That's correct.

13       **Q**       Okay. "Question. As error rates can go both ways,  
14 Bayesian statistics" -- I'm very impressed with this  
15 question, by the way.

16       **A**       There's a secret statistician somewhere on the jury.

17       **Q**       -- identifies false positives and false negatives  
18 (also true positives, true negatives). After review of the  
19 data, what percentage of the false negatives were there  
20 based on the McCann/Catizone red flag criteria? Meaning,  
21 how many prescriptions weren't flagged that should have been  
22 flagged based on their criteria? If you don't have an exact  
23 number, can you estimate it?"

24       **A**       Yeah, I'm afraid this is something that I would need  
25 to really set aside some time to actually do a little bit of

1       the computation. I mean, we'd have to first of all figure  
2       out how to even figure out the false positives and false  
3       negatives. That's not even very clear.

4           So the simple answer is that there's no way on the fly  
5       I can possibly estimate that.

6   **Q**       And so I just want to clarify that too, because here  
7       is just one example, and I don't know if this is what was --  
8       we looked at several different examples where you did some  
9       computations based off of various red flags. This was one  
10      of them; is that right?

11   **A**       Yeah, that's correct.

12   **Q**       And again, you don't know whether methadone is a  
13      short-acting a long-acting?

14   **A**       Well, you told me it is; but yes, before that, yeah.

15   **Q**       Other than what I have represented.

16           But if you were -- this is just simply doing the  
17       math -- calculating that if you did not intend to include  
18       methadone or shouldn't have included methadone as flag 9,  
19       this over-flags by approximately 58 percent; is that fair?

20   **A**       Well, I'd say 58 percent were flagged for inclusion of  
21       methadone, so 58 percent --

22   **Q**       And you're not saying one way or the other whether  
23       methadone should have been included?

24   **A**       Yeah, I'm just doing the calculation.

25   **Q**       So if somebody else concludes that methadone shouldn't

1 have been included, would this be an example of improperly  
2 applying red flag 9?

3 **A** Under the assumption methadone shouldn't be included,  
4 yes. I mean part of the reason the answer is a little  
5 complicated from the jury question is that we're just  
6 focusing on just one red flag, but there are many red flags  
7 and they might overlap.

8 So like when a red flag -- you know, if in like a  
9 situation like this, you know, we end up, you know, based on  
10 my analysis if, you know, some of these red flags are -- you  
11 know, we raise a question that they should be a red flag  
12 because they include methadone, and then there's maybe  
13 another red flag that also has a similar problem, those  
14 might be for the same prescription. So it gets to be a  
15 little hard to figure everything out when you're putting  
16 everything in aggregate for all the red flags.

17 So it wouldn't be as simple as just taking each  
18 individual red flag one at a time, looking at the fraction  
19 of flags that seem to not do what they're intending to do  
20 and add them up. You can't do it that simply,  
21 unfortunately.

22 **Q** Is it something that you could do with enough time if  
23 you were asked to do it? Well, I guess -- you know what,  
24 strike that question. I'm going to move on to the next one.

25 I think these are related, so I'm going to ask this

1 one, and then I can put up a slide too.

2 "When you reviewed the prescriptions you saw  
3 documentation about primary care and you saw patient records  
4 that it was acute?"

5 Maybe just another way to phrase this too is, can you  
6 explain sort of how you determined whether something was  
7 acute or was primary care based on the data you reviewed?

8 **A** Sure. The determination whether the prescriber was  
9 primary care was based on the prescriber ID and what their  
10 specialty was. So we didn't -- you know, we didn't need to  
11 look up any special documentation. It was actually part of  
12 the data.

13 Similarly, for whether the patient was acute, which  
14 basically is related to the supply of the drug, like how  
15 long the prescription lasted, that's also information  
16 already in the data. That's part of the prescription.

17 So, you know, we didn't need to look at any extra  
18 information beyond what was already in the data.

19 **Q** And so I think this relates to your analysis on  
20 Catizone's red flags 10 and 11. And I took this from the  
21 presentation, it's WMT-MDL-01585. I have another copy of  
22 just that I'm going to put down because it's a little bit  
23 clearer. You can see it's the same document for folks to  
24 see.

25 There's a second question that I think relates to the

1 same sort of subject matter, which is, "Are you saying that  
2 because chronic patients weren't included in Dr. McCann's  
3 data for flag (10 and 11, I believe) (4 percent versus 90s)  
4 the percentage of red flag prescription was incorrect?"

5 Maybe actually it would be better for me to put --  
6 this is the summary chart you created and this is the  
7 visualized representation of it, right?

8 And so if I put this here, let me see if I can move  
9 this up a little more, maybe you can answer the question  
10 that way.

11 **A** So I'm not actually saying correct or incorrect. I'm  
12 just simply stating that if you -- you end up accounting for  
13 patients that were chronic pain, pain patients seen in  
14 primary care, then that number reduces by a lot applying  
15 that guideline.

16 So I'm not saying it's correct or incorrect. I'm just  
17 simply saying that if you were to account for the CDC  
18 guideline, the number of flags would end up reducing. So  
19 it's -- you know, I'm not trying to make an evaluation of  
20 this.

21 **Q** And so basically you're saying if the CDC guidelines  
22 had been applied, there would have only been 4.7 percent of  
23 the prescriptions of what was actually flagged, only 4.7 of  
24 them would actually still be flagged?

25 **A** That's correct.

1       **Q**       And I guess that was for the sample, but it would be  
2       2.9 if you were looking at the entirety?

3       **A**       Right, that's right.

4       **Q**       I'm going to put this up here. It's "How many  
5       prescriptions of the 3,587 prescribers are the same and  
6       wrote the same prescription to the different patients?"

7                  And I think what this is referring to is -- hold on  
8       one second -- this particular summary that you prepared,  
9       WMT-MDL-01553 that we saw in the presentation. And that's  
10      with the 3,587 prescribers.

11                 So did you do this analysis?

12       **A**       Yes.

13       **Q**       And what about the question? Can you answer that?

14       **A**       Yeah. So the 3,587 are unique prescribers. They're  
15      all different from each other, but -- well, I didn't take a  
16      look at whether they wrote prescriptions for the same or  
17      different patients. This is just focusing on the  
18      prescribers.

19       **Q**       Okay. I think this is the last question from a juror,  
20      and I believe it relates to this chart that the jury saw,  
21      and it could have been about the one about patients.

22                  So you had a similar chart about patients with a prior  
23      fill at a Walmart store and you had one about prescribers,  
24      correct?

25       **A**       That's right.

1       **Q**       So I'm not sure if this question is relating to the  
2       patients or prescribers, but "Is prior fill a red flag  
3       resolution to the prescription in hand? What are your" --

4       **A**       I'm sorry, I can't see the question.

5       **Q**       Sorry. "Is prior fill a red flag resolution to the  
6       prescription in hand? What are your credentials to allow  
7       you to say yes or no?"

8       **A**       Yeah, so I suppose I would answer this question by  
9       saying that I don't have any particular credentials to say  
10      whether a prior fill is a resolution to this particular red  
11      flag. This again is just simply more a computation just to  
12      inform you how many of the prescriptions involved a prior --  
13      either, you know, prior fill by the same patient or the  
14      prior fill prescribed by the same prescriber.

15                  So I definitely don't claim that I have the  
16      credentials to add meaning to that conclusion.

17       **Q**       You're not a pharmacist, you're not talking about the  
18      proper way to resolve a red flag, correct?

19       **A**       That's correct.

20       **Q**       And you're just providing the data so that other  
21      people can draw the appropriate conclusions?

22       **A**       I'm providing the summary of the data, yup.

23       **Q**       Okay. I think that's it for jury questions. And so I  
24      have I think just one subject I want to cover on my own.

25                  Mr. Lanier showed you this chart, and I believe you

1       testified you've never seen it before or you don't recall  
2       seeing it. Is that right?

3       **A**       I don't recall seeing this, no.

4       **Q**       And Mr. Lanier also represented that it was something  
5       that Dr. McCann created.

6                  Do you recall that?

7       **A**       I recall him saying that, yes.

8       **Q**       And I just want to look, this is talking about market  
9       share; is that fair? By the title. We don't know what it  
10      is.

11      **A**       It's summary of margin share by pharmacy, and all the  
12      units are dosage units.

13      **Q**       So you've never seen this before, you don't know who  
14      created this?

15      **A**       I don't recall having seen this.

16      **Q**       And I just want to put down here, you see where it  
17      says "Source: OARRS"?

18      **A**       Yes, I do.

19      **Q**       Hold on to that thought.

20      **A**       Okay.

21      **Q**       One of the things that you reviewed for your testimony  
22      was the deposition of Dr. McCann, correct?

23      **A**       I did, yes.

24      **Q**       All right. We can give a copy of this to counsel and  
25      the judge.

1           This is a copy of that deposition that you reviewed,  
2 right? This is Lake and Trumbull County, deposition of  
3 Craig McCann taken June 11, 2021?

4   **A**    That's right.

5   **Q**    So I want to turn to page 224 of this deposition.

6           And the witness here is Dr. Craig McCann, correct?

7   **A**    Yes.

8   **Q**    And so the question is: I'm telling you, you could  
9 have done a market share analysis for the OARRS data,  
10 couldn't you have?

11           There's an objection, and Dr. McCann testified: I  
12 don't know. I didn't think about it. I wouldn't use OARRS  
13 data. I would use the ARCOS data, or I would use the  
14 defendant transaction data. I don't understand why you --

15           And then the question goes: How could you do a market  
16 share analysis with ARCOS data or the defendant transaction  
17 data?

18           Dr. McCann testified: Well, because the ARCOS data  
19 identifies the distributors and the pharmacies, so if you  
20 wanted to do a market share analysis of distributors  
21 shipping to pharmacies in Lake and Trumbull County, you  
22 would do it with the ARCOS data. I'm completely confused by  
23 this line of questioning.

24           Question: What if you wanted to analyze dispensed  
25 products?

1 Dr. McCann: I would still use the ARCOS data, not the  
2 OARRS data.

3 Do you recall reading that testimony?

4      **A**       Yeah, I have a vague recollection of that particular  
5      passage.

6 Q So when you did your market share numbers that you  
7 testified about, the 3.15 percent for Walmart, you used the  
8 ARCos data that Dr. McCann used, correct?

**A** That is correct. I did not use the OARRS data.

10 MS. FUMERTON: I'm going to pass the witness.  
11 Thank you.

12 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

13 THE COURT: Anything from CVS or Walgreens? I  
14 figure not, but I always ask.

15 MR. DELINSKY: No, thank you, Your Honor.

16 MS. SWIFT: No, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Thank you.

18 You're on, Mr. Lanier.

19 | -----

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. LANIER:

22 Q Okay, sir, I want to go over what Ms. Fumerton asked  
23 you at the end about the chart, but before that I want to go  
24 over a couple of juror questions, and I want to just make  
25 sure that we've covered them adequately. All right?

1       **A**     Sure thing.

2       **Q**     First of all, you were asked questions about the CDC  
3            guidelines and the effects that it had on the numbers.

4            Remember those?

5       **A**     Yes, I do.

6       **Q**     All right. Now, you have no basis and expertise to  
7            challenge Carmen Catizone on the CDC guidelines and how they  
8            should be applied, fair?

9       **A**     That's fair, yes.

10      **Q**     All right. So when you do all your graphs and stuff,  
11           that's based on assumptions that were provided to you in  
12           essence by the legal team, not by Carmen Catizone, fair?

13                   MS. FUMERTON: Objection.

14      **A**     Yeah, those were -- those were not decisions that I  
15           made.

16      **Q**     Correct. Thank you.

17                   Next, there was a juror question on whether or not you  
18           had reviewed the exact prescriptions.

19                   Remember that?

20      **A**     Yes.

21      **Q**     And as I understand it, you did not review the exact  
22           prescriptions. You didn't put your eyeballs on them, did  
23           you?

24      **A**     I did not look at anything other than just the data  
25           that was provided to me, not --

1       **Q**       So when Ms. Fumerton revised the question to ask you  
2       if you reviewed a data set, you understand the data set is  
3       different than the exact prescriptions the juror was asking  
4       about, right?

5       **A**       I mean, if there were -- yeah, if the juror was asking  
6       about the actual prescription on, like a piece of paper, I  
7       did not see any actual prescriptions.

8       **Q**       Thank you.

9                  Next. You were asked about false positives and false  
10         negatives.

11                 Remember?

12       **A**       Yeah.

13       **Q**       Now, as a practical matter, you said there's no way --  
14       or you had not done the analysis to provide how many false  
15       negatives; in other words, things that should have triggered  
16       a red flag but weren't counted as a red flag.

17                 Right?

18       **A**       I didn't compute any false negatives, that's correct.

19       **Q**       And while you didn't do that on the data set that you  
20       had, there are just, common sense, a lot of red flags that  
21       may have been present that no one can determine from the  
22       data set. Fair?

23       **A**       Yeah, there's -- there might be plenty of reasons that  
24       prescriptions, you know, are not potentially concerning.

25       **Q**       So, for example, if the jury's heard about red flags

1 being triggered by the behavior of the person coming in to  
2 buy the prescription, that's not something you're going to  
3 see in the data set. It's something that's going to be  
4 visually observed by a pharmacist. Fair?

5 MS. FUMERTON: Objection.

6 THE COURT: Overruled.

7 **A** Yeah, there's -- the data set is not going to  
8 characterize every nuance of what people's behaviors are in  
9 prescription --

10 **Q** Data set won't characterize, based on the way you  
11 reviewed the data set at least, if three people come  
12 together in the same car with the same prescription. It's  
13 not going to be in the data set, is it?

14 **A** No, it's not.

15 **Q** Okay. So there are potential red flags that aren't  
16 picked up by anybody's analysis, the false negatives, fair?

17 MS. FUMERTON: Objection.

18 THE COURT: Overruled.

19 **A** Yes, that's -- I think that's accurate.

20 **Q** All right. Next, you did a pills per county per  
21 capita type analysis from one of the juror questions.  
22 Remember?

23 **A** Yes, I do.

24 **Q** All right. I'm trying to make sure that we've got  
25 that in the record right.

1           So you took this figure from Walmart's 1541A, and it  
2 was 10 million --

3   **A**      10 million.

4   **Q**      -- 380,575 pills. Right?

5   **A**      Correct.

6   **Q**      And to do the math off of that, it's not that tough.

7       You can take that and divide it by 450,000, which is roughly  
8 the number of people in the two counties -- (pause)

9                  MS. FUMERTON: Is that a question?

10               MR. LANIER: Hold on. I'm not through with  
11 the question.

12   **Q**      You can divide it, and you can get -- divide that  
13 10,380,575 by the 450,000 in each county, and you can come  
14 up with how many pills per capita; true?

15   **A**      You can do that calculation, yes.

16   **Q**      And roughly -- you got your handy-dandy iPhone --

17   **A**      I can. Do you want me to take it out again?

18   **Q**      -- or you want to just trust me, it's around 23,  
19 figuring our iPhones do it the same?

20   **A**      If that calculation were done correctly, then that's  
21 certainly the procedure to do the calculation. I can do it  
22 if you like.

23   **Q**      Sure. Let's make it precise for the record. His  
24 Honor likes precision.

25   **A**      So we've got the 10,380,557 divided by -- and can you

1 show the population number?

2 **Q** 450,000.

3 **A** Can you show it exactly?

4 **Q** Which chart has that?

5 Here we go. Ooh, it's going to be higher than I  
6 thought. 439,668 people.

7 **A** Right, so it's 23.6 dosage units per capita.

8 **Q** I was underestimating, wasn't I.

9 We could do the same thing, by the way, with the  
10 hydrocodone. If the dosage units of hydrocodone were  
11 8,551,367, you could divide that by the 439,668, and  
12 determine how many hydrocodone pills per person were put out  
13 by Walmart, couldn't you?

14 **A** You could do that calculation, sure.

15 **Q** And what would your answer be?

16 **A** I guess I should leave my calculator app open, huh?

17 8,551,367 divided by 439,668.

18 So that's 19.45.

19 **Q** I'm sorry, sir, I missed that.

20 **A** 19.45.

21 **Q** Hydrocodone pills per person, man, woman, and child;  
22 fair?

23 **A** That's what that division is, yes.

24 **Q** All right.

25 MR. LANIER: Your Honor, I need to clarify

1 something on the record and with the witness.

2 I want to go to Plaintiffs' Demo 123.

3 **Q** This is from the OARRS data, and it is a summary of  
4 market share by pharmacy.

5 Do you see that?

6 Do you remember the questions Ms. Fumerton asked you?

7 **A** Yes.

8 **Q** I had been under the understanding that this was  
9 prepared by McCann himself and in his report. It's my  
10 understanding this was pulled from the OARRS data. And so I  
11 want the record to reflect that it is evidently not from  
12 McCann's report but straight from the OARRS data.

13 MS. FUMERTON: Objection.

14 MR. LANIER: Your Honor, I think I need to put  
15 that on the record.

16 MS. FUMERTON: We don't know where it's from  
17 now.

18 MR. LANIER: Yes.

19 THE COURT: I don't know what -- you can ask  
20 him a question.

21 MR. LANIER: Thank you.

22 BY MR. LANIER:

23 **Q** Sir, if the OARRS data shows these dosage units -- by  
24 the way, those dosage units aren't that different than what  
25 you found, is it?

1       **A**     What are you referring to?

2       **Q**     Well, you have dosage units of 10,380,000 for just  
3     those years 2006 to 2014, right?

4       **A**     Yeah. I mean, I can stand by the numbers that I  
5     computed.

6       **Q**     And these numbers go up to 2018, four years later,  
7     correct?

8                   MS. FUMERTON: Again, objection. Foundation.  
9     We don't even know what this is.

10                  THE COURT: Overruled. You can ask a  
11     question, but I'd like to hear the question.

12       **Q**     Sir, you understand there's a difference in years  
13     here. There are four years in Demonstrative 123 that were  
14     not included by you at the top end at your 10 million  
15     figure. Fair?

16       **A**     Yeah, that's what appears on the chart you're showing.

17       **Q**     And by the same token, you've included 2006 and 2007,  
18     two years at the bottom end, that are not at the chart, just  
19     to be fair?

20       **A**     That seems to be the difference.

21       **Q**     All right. That's great?

22                  MR. LANIER: Thank you, Judge. I wanted to  
23     clarify the record.

24                  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much,  
25     Doctor.

1                   THE WITNESS: Thank you.

2                   THE COURT: We appreciate your appearance, and  
3 safe travels back.

4                   THE WITNESS: I appreciate it. Thank you,  
5 everyone.

6                   MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, may we get our next  
7 witness?

8                   THE COURT: Yes, you may, Mr. Delinsky.

9                   MS. FUMERTON: Your Honor, may I approach to  
10 give you the juror questions?

11                  THE COURT: Yes. Good idea.

12                  MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, CVS calls Robert  
13 Hill.

14                  THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.

15                  (Witness sworn.)

16                  THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated, and  
17 you may take off your mask while testifying.

18                  You may proceed, Mr. Delinsky.

19                  MR. DELINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor.

20                  And good afternoon, Mr. Hill.

21                  THE WITNESS: Good afternoon.

22                  THE COURT: Are you ready to go?

23                  THE WITNESS: Yes.

24                  THE COURT: All right.

25

1 ROBERT HILL

2 - - - - -

3 DIRECT EXAMINATION

4 BY MR. DELINSKY:

5 **Q** Mr. Hill, what I want to do first is explain to the  
6 ladies and gentlemen of the jury why you're here, and then  
7 we're going to move back in time and then go through some of  
8 your background and get to the real stuff. Okay?

9 **A** Okay.

10 **Q** Mr. Hill, did you formerly work at the United States  
11 Drug Enforcement Administration?

12 **A** Yes, I did.

13 **Q** For how long?

14 **A** 25 year, 3 months, and 21 days.

15 MR. LANIER: How many hours?

16 **Q** When did you start at DEA?

17 **A** September 10, 1989.

18 **Q** Did you retire -- or you already told us how long you  
19 remained there.

20 Did you retire from DEA?

21 **A** Yes, I did.

22 **Q** What year?

23 **A** December 31, 2014.

24 **Q** Prior to your retirement, did you hold any positions  
25 at DEA Headquarters?

1 | **A** Yes, I did.

2 Q What were those positions?

3       **A**       I was a staff coordinator. I was the section chief of  
4                   the Pharmaceutical Investigation section. And I was the  
5                   executive assistant to the deputy assistant administrator  
6                   for the Office of Diversion Control.

7 Q And as executive assistant, was that essentially in  
8 plain terms the chief of staff to the deputy assistant  
9 administrator for the Office of Diversion Control?

10      **A**      That's correct.

11 Q Okay. And, Mr. Hill, are you here to provide expert  
12 opinions in this case?

13      **A**      Yes.

14 Q All right. Now let's step back. We know why you're  
15 here, and let's just step back.

16 Where do you live?

17      **A**      Centreville, Virginia.

18 | Q That's not where you grew up though, right?

19      **A**           No, it's not.

20 Q Where did you grow up?

21      **A**      Detroit, Michigan.

22 Q Okay. Let's just focus on the present for now.

23           Do you live in the same general area as DEA  
24 Headquarters?

25      **A**      Yes.

1       **Q**     About how many miles away?

2       **A**     About 20 miles west.

3       **Q**     Married?

4       **A**     Yes.

5       **Q**     For how long?

6       **A**     26 years.

7       **Q**     Does your wife have a background in law enforcement?

8       **A**     Yes.

9       **Q**     Was she an agent?

10      **A**     Yes.

11      **Q**     For what agency or agencies?

12      **A**     11 years with Secret Service and then 14 years with  
13      TSA.

14      **Q**     You have a son?

15      **A**     Yes.

16      **Q**     In college?

17      **A**     Yes.

18      **Q**     Do you keep him close?

19      **A**     Yes.

20      **Q**     Because you feel you need to keep him close?

21      **A**     Yes.

22      **Q**     Is he in school in Virginia not too far from where you  
23      live?

24      **A**     Yes.

25      **Q**     Okay. I won't ask you why you have to keep him close,

1 but I have a son so...

2 You grew up in Michigan. Did you say Detroit?

3 **A** Yes, I grew up in Detroit, Michigan.

4 **Q** What neighborhood?

5 **A** West side.

6 **Q** Where did you go to high school?

7 **A** Chauncey High School.

8 **Q** Did you attend college?

9 **A** Yes, I did.

10 **Q** Where?

11 **A** Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan.

12 **Q** Okay. What did you study when you were at Wayne  
13 State?

14 **A** Criminal justice.

15 **Q** Why did you study criminal justice?

16 **A** Because I wanted to work in law enforcement when I  
17 graduated.

18 **Q** When did you realize you wanted to work in law  
19 enforcement?

20 **A** When I was younger, around middle school.

21 **Q** Okay. Did you obtain your degree from Wayne State?

22 **A** Yes, I did.

23 **Q** What year?

24 **A** May of 1988.

25 **Q** Before we move to your first job, let's just get

1 something out of the way.

2 Your degree was in criminal justice?

3 **A** That's correct.

4 **Q** It was not in pharmacy?

5 **A** That's correct.

6 **Q** You don't have a pharmacy degree?

7 **A** That's correct.

8 **Q** Are you a pharmacist?

9 **A** No, I am not.

10 **Q** Is there any doubt about that?

11 **A** No doubt at all.

12 **Q** Have you ever been a pharmacist?

13 MR. WEINBERGER: We'll stipulate he was never  
14 a pharmacist, isn't a pharmacist, wasn't a pharmacist.

15 **Q** All right. Let's just get this out of the way, okay,  
16 once and for all.

17 Mr. Hill, true, false, you are not a pharmacist?

18 **A** True.

19 **Q** Okay. Are you, however, an expert in drug law  
20 enforcement?

21 **A** Yes.

22 **Q** Are you an expert in DEA compliance?

23 **A** Yes.

24 **Q** Are you an expert in pharmaceutical drug diversion?

25 **A** Yes.

1       **Q**     Okay. What did you do right after college?

2       **A**     I became a police officer in the City of Dearborn,  
3 Michigan.

4       **Q**     Were you on the beat, undercover, mix of both?

5       **A**     Combination of both.

6       **Q**     Okay. Were you in uniform, plainclothes?

7       **A**     A combination of both.

8       **Q**     How long did you serve for the City of Dearborn,  
9 Michigan, as a police officer?

10      **A**     It would have been just over a year. I got hired  
11 there August of 1988, and I left in September of 1989.

12      **Q**     Why did you leave?

13      **A**     I got hired by DEA.

14      **Q**     Why did you want to go to DEA?

15      **A**     When I was a young kid, of course every kid when you  
16 think of law enforcement, you want to work for the FBI. But  
17 as I learned about DEA around in middle school, I thought  
18 that would be fun to do and a nice agency to work for. So I  
19 reached out to the recruiter, had them send me some  
20 information so I can know how to prepare myself. And then  
21 when I graduated, I applied to DEA, like right before I  
22 graduated.

23      **Q**     Did you start at DEA in 1989?

24      **A**     Yes, September 10, 1989.

25      **Q**     What was your position at DEA at the time?

1 | **A** A special agent.

2 | Q Where did you work?

3       **A**       Well, after you first get hired, you go to Quantico,  
4                   Virginia, to go through your training, and then you come  
5                   back. And so I came back at the end of December, and I was  
6                   assigned to the Detroit Field Division, which is where I was  
7                   hired. So my whole time started at the Detroit Field  
8                   Division.

9 Q And Quantico, Virginia, I associate that with the FBI.

Is that where DEA trains as well?

11      **A**       Yes. At the time, DEA was training at the FBI  
12      Academy.

13 Q Okay. The Detroit Field Office, did that cover only  
14 Detroit, only Michigan, or a broader geography?

15      **A**      It was a broader geography.

16 | Q What other geographies did it cover?

19 Q What did you do as a special agent?

20       **A**       You worked cases on individuals and organizations that  
21                  were alleged to have violated the Controlled Substance Act  
22                  or other state narcotics violations.

23 Q Work undercover?

24      **A**      Yes.

25 Q Did you handle cases involving heroin?

1     **A**     Yes.

2     **Q**     What was your first undercover case, without divulging  
3        details you can't divulge?

4     **A**     It was a heroin case.

5     **Q**     Was heroin a serious problem at that point in time?

6     **A**     Yes, it was.

7     **Q**     Okay. And that's late '80s, early '90s?

8     **A**     Early '90s, late '80s, early '90s.

9     **Q**     Any major drug rings that you worked on that were  
10      public?

11    **A**     Yes.

12    **Q**     Can you name a few?

13    **A**     The Young Boys Incorporated, phase II. The Colaccio  
14      Crowley [ph] organization.

15    **Q**     Where were they based?

16    **A**     They were based out of the Detroit metro area, as well  
17      as other investigations that had a regional or national or  
18      international effect to them.

19    **Q**     Did you work on cases involving importation from  
20      Columbia?

21    **A**     Yes.

22    **Q**     Did you work on cases that involved importation from  
23      places like Burma, Laos, Thailand?

24    **A**     Yes.

25    **Q**     Pakistan and Iran?

1       **A**     And Afghanistan, which is the Golden Crescent, yes.

2       **Q**     Did you work on any pharmaceutical cases?

3       **A**     Only as a support at that time supporting the  
4              diversion groups that were in Detroit.

5       **Q**     Okay. Can you explain to the ladies and gentlemen of  
6              the jury how DEA is organized in terms of its division  
7              between DIs, diversion investigators, and special agents?

8       **A**     Yes. So the special agents are the actual law  
9              enforcement gun carriers that can make arrests and do search  
10             warrants; where the diversion investigators, they can do  
11             investigations, but there's certain things that they can't  
12             do on the street, like work undercover or do surveillance,  
13             without the assistance of a special agent.

14      **Q**     Okay. I asked you about pharmaceutical cases. Can  
15            you explain what those are?

16      **A**     Yes.

17      **Q**     I think we know, but just out of an abundance of  
18            caution.

19      **A**     Pharmaceutical cases are cases that are involving  
20            controlled pharmaceuticals that are being diverted for an  
21            illicit or illegitimate purpose.

22      **Q**     So to put it in language I understand best, are those  
23            cases involving prescription drugs?

24      **A**     Yes.

25      **Q**     Okay, that are classified as controlled substances?

1      **A**      Yes.

2      **Q**      Okay. Insofar as you assisted DIs in those cases when  
3                you were a special agent, did you do undercover work?

4      **A**      Yes, we would do undercover to help them, yes.

5      **Q**      Did you do undercover work against doctors who were  
6                suspected of improperly prescribing controlled substances?

7      **A**      Yes.

8      **Q**      Okay. Did you do surveillance against doctors?

9      **A**      Yes.

10     **Q**      Okay. Did you do surveillance and undercover work  
11                against persons who were going to doctors to try to get  
12                prescriptions they shouldn't get?

13     **A**      Yes.

14     **Q**      Did you work on investigations of pharmacies?

15     **A**      Yes.

16     **Q**      Did you ever go undercover to try to get, you know,  
17                bogus prescriptions filled?

18     **A**      Yes.

19     **Q**      And how long were you in this position as a regular  
20                DEA special agent in Detroit?

21     **A**      I was assigned to Detroit until November of 1998.

22     **Q**      Okay. Now, I want to -- wasn't there a switch  
23                starting in '96 or so?

24     **A**      Yes.

25     **Q**      Okay. We're going to get to that in a sec, okay?

1       **A**      Okay.

2       **Q**      But before we move there, did you have a philosophy  
3                  about how to go about your work as a special agent for the  
4                  DEA?

5       **A**      Yes.

6       **Q**      Okay. What was your philosophy?

7       **A**      My philosophy was to even though you're working  
8                  investigations, you would make sure that you treat the  
9                  people that you're targeting with the utmost respect because  
10                 they're still human, and you would also have the sympathy  
11                 for them and the empathy for them to put yourself in their  
12                 shoes. So you would always, if you could, try and give them  
13                 a second chance on life.

14       **Q**      When you were a special agent for the DEA, who were  
15                 you serving?

16       **A**      The American public.

17       **Q**      All right. Special agent, working cases, '89 to '96,  
18                 right?

19       **A**      That's correct.

20       **Q**      Okay. What happened in '96?

21       **A**      In 1996 I was reassigned as the divisional coordinator  
22                 in June or July of 1996.

23       **Q**      Now, as the divisional coordinator, were you in charge  
24                 of training?

25       **A**      Yes.

1       **Q**      Who did you train?

2       **A**      DEA employees, whether they were special agents or  
3                  diversion investigators, or professional employees which we  
4                  would call PATCO; other federal law enforcement officers, as  
5                  well as other state and local officers. And that would be  
6                  anyone within the states of Michigan, Ohio, and Kentucky.

7       **Q**      Okay. So your training obligations beginning in 1996  
8                  extended across three states?

9       **A**      That's correct.

10      **Q**      Including Ohio?

11      **A**      Yes.

12      **Q**      It included federal law enforcement?

13      **A**      Yes.

14      **Q**      And state law enforcement?

15      **A**      Yes.

16      **Q**      And what would you provide training on?

17      **A**      On drug investigations, surveillance, undercover,  
18                  tactical training, administrative training, and legal  
19                  training.

20      **Q**      Did the training concern investigations of illicit  
21                  drugs?

22      **A**      Yes, it did.

23      **Q**      Did the training concern investigations of  
24                  prescription drugs?

25      **A**      Yes, it did, if the area that we were putting on the

1 training, if that was a drug issue of concern or drug of  
2 concern.

3 **Q** For how long did you serve as the training coordinator  
4 out of the Detroit Field Office?

5 **A** I believe it was from, like I said, June or July of  
6 1996 until November of 1998.

7 **Q** Where did you go in 1998?

8 **A** I was assigned down in Central America to the country  
9 of Belize.

10 **Q** And were you assigned by DEA?

11 **A** Yes. I was reassigned by DEA, yes.

12 **Q** Okay. Bad weather, right?

13 **A** It was hot.

14 **Q** Good scuba?

15 **A** I didn't try any.

16 **Q** I wouldn't have either.

17 What were you doing for DEA in Belize?

18 **A** When I was in Belize, my duties were to serve as an  
19 adviser to the U.S. Ambassador to Belize, as well as to the  
20 host nation, which was the Government of Belize, on  
21 counternarcotics issues.

22 **Q** Were there issues with narcotics at that time in  
23 Belize?

24 **A** Yes.

25 **Q** For how long did you serve in that position?

1       **A**       I was in that position until April of 2000, when I got  
2 promoted to a group supervisor.

3       **Q**       Okay. Where were you appointed to a group supervisor?

4       **A**       In Detroit, at the Detroit Field Division.

5       **Q**       So in 2000 you moved back to Detroit from Belize?

6       **A**       Yes, in April of 2000.

7       **Q**       Okay. And what were your responsibilities as a  
8 supervisory agent or as a group supervisor?

9       **A**       As the group supervisor, you monitor the day-to-day  
10 activities of the agents and state and local task force  
11 officers that you have in your group regarding  
12 investigations that are dealing with violations of the  
13 Controlled Substance Act or state narcotics statutes.

14       **Q**       Did you supervise pharmaceutical investigations?

15       **A**       Supervising would not be the correct way. It would be  
16 more of a support role, because my group, I was the group  
17 supervisor for Enforcement Group 3. And Enforcement Group 3  
18 was the designated Diversion Response Group for the Detroit  
19 Field Division also.

20       **Q**       All right. Diversion meaning diversion of  
21 prescription drugs?

22       **A**       Yes.

23       **Q**       Correct, all right.

24                  How long were you in this role in Detroit as a  
25 supervisory agent?

1       **A**      From April of 2000 until October of 2005.

2       **Q**      Okay. What did you do next?

3       **A**      I was reassigned to headquarters, DEA Headquarters.

4       **Q**      Okay. And I think you already testified about that.

5                  DEA Headquarters is in northern Virginia?

6       **A**      Yes. Arlington, Virginia, yes.

7       **Q**      So did you move your family at that point in time?

8       **A**      Yes.

9       **Q**      Okay. What were you assigned to do at DEA  
10      Headquarters? And I think we're at 2005. Do I have that  
11      right?

12      **A**      Yes, October 2005.

13      **Q**      What were you assigned to do?

14      **A**      I was assigned -- so the -- as a staff coordinator to  
15      the Latin and Caribbean section.

16      **Q**      What were your responsibilities as staff coordinator  
17      in that section?

18      **A**      Those responsibilities were to assist the DEA offices  
19      that were located in Latin America or the Caribbean in the  
20      furtherance of drug investigations or investigations dealing  
21      with nexuses to terrorist groups.

22      **Q**      Were there significant narcotics issues in that region  
23      that you were responsible for handling?

24      **A**      Yes. That would have been in the Bahamas, Haiti,  
25      Surinam, and San Juan, Puerto Rico.

1       **Q**      How long were you in this position?

2       **A**      I was in that position until December of 2008, when I  
3                  was promoted again.

4       **Q**      What position were you promoted to?

5       **A**      I was promoted to the section chief of the  
6                  Pharmaceutical Investigation section in the Office of  
7                  Diversion Control.

8       **Q**      Okay. Let's just stop here for a moment.

9                  Who promoted you to that position?

10      **A**     Joseph Rannazzisi.

11      **Q**      Okay. Did you know Mr. Rannazzisi?

12      **A**     Yes.

13      **Q**      How long had you known him?

14      **A**     Since I came on with DEA, since 1989.

15      **Q**      How did you know him?

16      **A**     We were special agents together in Detroit. We were  
17                  subsequently supervisors together in Detroit. Then Joe was  
18                  promoted, and he became my direct supervisor as the  
19                  assistant special agent in charge. Then Joe was  
20                  subsequently transferred to Headquarters.

21                  Then when I was subsequently transferred to  
22                  Headquarters and assigned to the Latin and Caribbean  
23                  section, Joe was my second line supervisor when I was in  
24                  that function. And then he subsequently promoted me to be  
25                  the section chief of the Pharmaceutical Investigation

1 section.

2 **Q** Okay. As section chief of the Pharmaceutical  
3 Investigation section, what were your responsibilities?

4 **A** My responsibility was first to serve as DEA technical  
5 expert on strategies and programs to address the diversion  
6 of controlled pharmaceuticals.

7 **Q** Did you play any role or oversight in investigations  
8 of DEA registrants regarding the diversion of prescription  
9 drugs?

10 **A** Yes.

11 **Q** Did that include pharmacies?

12 **A** Yes.

13 **Q** Did you oversee investigations and actions by DEA  
14 against nonregistrants regarding the diversion of  
15 prescription drugs?

16 **A** Yes.

17 **Q** How would that come up that DEA would be proceeding  
18 against a nonregisterant who was not sort of registered with  
19 it?

20 **A** Well, what you would have is if you would have  
21 traditional street organizations that were involved in  
22 selling the illicit drugs, meaning, you know, like the  
23 cocaine, heroin, marijuana, well, then if they would branch  
24 off and they would start selling controlled pharmaceuticals.  
25 So because they -- and so what we would call them is

1 polydrug organizations.

2 And so because they were involved with controlled  
3 pharmaceuticals, that also fell under the auspices of the  
4 Pharmaceutical Investigation section even though they were  
5 not DEA registrants.

6 **Q** So am I right that as section chief of the  
7 Pharmaceutical Investigation section, your focus was  
8 prescription drugs, correct?

9 **A** Yes.

10 **Q** Now, there are other parts of DEA that focus on  
11 illegal drugs, correct?

12 **A** Yes.

13 **Q** Okay. And that was -- those were staffed by other --  
14 and led by other persons?

15 **A** And other sections, yes.

16 **Q** Okay. Did any of the work you did as section chief of  
17 the Pharmaceutical Investigations concern prescription  
18 opioid medications?

19 **A** Yes.

20 **Q** Okay. And, Mr. Hill, I notice that you're being very  
21 careful and clipped in some of your answers here.

22 Are you allowed to disclose nonpublic information  
23 about your work at DEA?

24 **A** No.

25 **Q** Are those just the ordinary rules that apply to former

1       DEA and other Government officials?

2       **A**      Yes.

3       **Q**      All right. Let's just stop here. Really quick  
4 question.

5                  When DEA investigates or looks at pharmacies, does it  
6 consider the ratio of noncontrolled prescriptions the  
7 pharmacy fills to the controlled prescriptions the pharmacy  
8 fills?

9       **A**      Yes.

10      **Q**      Why?

11      **A**      Because it gives you an inclination on if the pharmacy  
12 is performing as a normal pharmacy or within the confines of  
13 a normal pharmacy.

14      **Q**      And by "normal pharmacy," do you mean a pharmacy  
15 that's meeting the overall medicine needs of a community?

16      **A**      Meeting the overall medicine needs of the community,  
17 as well as operating within the compliance of state and  
18 federal regulations.

19      **Q**      Is there a general, and I mean general, benchmark that  
20 DEA looks to for a healthy noncontrolled-prescription to  
21 controlled-prescription ratio?

22      **A**      Yes.

23      **Q**      And what's that general guideline?

24      **A**      80 to 20, meaning 80 percent noncontrol, 20 percent  
25 controls.

1       **Q**       And if as a general matter that's a guideline that  
2       might suggest that if that's the breakdown, a pharmacy's  
3       relatively healthy.

4                  Do I have that right?

5       **A**       Yes.

6       **Q**       Now, is that standard a be-all, end-all?

7       **A**       No, not at all.

8       **Q**       Can you have pharmacies that dispense a much higher  
9       percentage of controlled substances that can be a healthy  
10      pharmacy doing so properly?

11      **A**       Yes.

12      **Q**       And likewise, can you have a pharmacy that's  
13      dispensing a lower percentage of controlled substances but  
14      isn't doing it the right way?

15                  MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, I think we --

16                  THE COURT: I don't want a speaking objection.  
17      So is there an objection?

18                  MR. WEINBERGER: Sorry. Yes, Your Honor.

19                  THE COURT: All right. Well, let's go on the  
20      headphones.

21                  (At side bar at 2:21 p.m.)

22                  MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, we've been going  
23      about 35 minutes now, and 90 percent of these questions have  
24      been leading questions. And for purposes of background, no  
25      issues, but if we could just have --

1                   THE COURT: All right. This is an expert. I  
2 assume he's written a report, so I allow some leeway with  
3 experts so we can get through it. So I didn't think that  
4 was a terrible question. So, but I guess, Mr. Delinsky, if  
5 you can do a little less leading, I appreciate it.

6                   MR. DELINSKY: Will do, Your Honor.

7                   (In open court at 2:22 p.m.)

8 BY MR. DELINSKY:

9                   **Q**       Mr. Hill, do you remember the question or should I  
10                  rephrase it?

11                  **A**       Could you rephrase it, please?

12                  **Q**       Sure.

13                  If a pharmacy dispenses less than 20 percent  
14 controlled substances, does that necessarily mean that it's  
15 dispensing the right way?

16                  **A**       No, it does not.

17                  **Q**       So this 80/20 -- is this 80/20 just a guideline?

18                  **A**       Yes.

19                  **Q**       Okay. Do you know what ARCos data is?

20                  **A**       Yes.

21                  **Q**       What is it?

22                  **A**       ARCos data is data that is presented and given to DEA  
23 from registrants depending on their business model, and it's  
24 either if they're a manufacturer or distributor. And what  
25 it does is it's a comprehensive system that follows the

1       movement of controlled substances from the manufacturing  
2       point, to the distribution point, to the end user that when  
3       it's dispensed when it goes to a pharmacy.

4       **Q**       So does the ARCOS data, and I think you may have  
5       answered this, include data about how much of a controlled  
6       substance a pharmacy receives?

7       **A**       Yes, if it's ARCOS reportable.

8       **Q**       And does ARCOS-reportable data include data on  
9       prescription pain medications that are classified as  
10      Schedule II controlled substances?

11      **A**       Yes.

12      **Q**       Is there a group at DEA that crunches the ARCOS  
13      numbers and analyzes them?

14      **A**       Yes.

15      **Q**       At the time you were head of the Pharmaceutical  
16      Investigation section, to whom did that group report?

17      **A**       Myself as the section chief.

18      **Q**       For how long were you in this position?

19      **A**       I was in that position from January, I believe it was  
20      the 9th, of 2009, till June 30 of 2012.

21      **Q**       What was your next position at DEA?

22      **A**       I was reassigned to be the executive assistant to the  
23      deputy assistant administrator for the Office of Diversion  
24      Control.

25      **Q**       Who was the deputy assistant administer for the Office

1 of Diversion Control at the time?

2 **A** Joseph Rannazzisi.

3 **Q** Were you -- would it be fair to characterize your  
4 responsibilities as being his chief of staff?

5 **A** Yes.

6 **Q** Okay. In that position, did you work on issues  
7 pertaining to the diversion of controlled substances?

8 **A** Yes.

9 **Q** Pertaining to the -- did you work on issues pertaining  
10 to the regulation of pharmacies, doctors, and other  
11 registrants in connection with the prescribing and  
12 dispensing of controlled substances?

13 **A** Yes.

14 **Q** Did you work on DEA investigations of registrants?

15 **A** Yes.

16 **Q** Did you work on DEA education efforts on the issues of  
17 pharmaceutical drug diversion and CSA compliance?

18 **A** Yes.

19 **Q** For how long were you in this position?

20 **A** I was in that position until I retired on December 31,  
21 2014.

22 **Q** Okay. When you were in this position, did you make  
23 presentations?

24 **A** Yes.

25 **Q** Did you make presentations at Pharmacy Diversion

1 Awareness conferences?

2 **A** Yes.

3 **Q** Are those called PDACs?

4 **A** Yes.

5 **Q** Can you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury what  
6 a PDAC is?

7 **A** A PDAC is a conference that DEA would put on for  
8 pharmacy registrants, which means you had to work for a  
9 pharmacy registrant to attend. It was a one-day course that  
10 went for 8 hours over two days, so that way it was always  
11 done on the weekend, so if you couldn't make it on one day  
12 you could try the other. It was always on a Saturday and a  
13 Sunday. And it was to make the pharmacy registrant  
14 community aware of the prescription drug abuse issue within  
15 the United States.

16 **Q** And when you say pharmacy registrant, let me try to  
17 bring it down. Do you mean these presentations were given  
18 to pharmacists?

19 **A** They were given to pharmacists, yes.

20 **Q** Were the subjects of these -- did the subjects of  
21 these presentations include corresponding responsibility?

22 **A** Yes.

23 **Q** Did they contain a discussion of red flags or  
24 potential red flags?

25 **A** Yes.

1       **Q**       And when did DEA start giving these PDAC  
2 presentations?

3       **A**       The first one would have been in September of 2011.

4       **Q**       Why didn't DEA start until 2011?

5       **A**       It's hard to say why at the time we didn't start till  
6 2011, but it was the time to make a formal program that we  
7 could do and make sure that the pharmacy community was  
8 available and was able to get that information.

9       **Q**       Were these PDAC conferences that began in 2011 the  
10 first time that DEA officially provided lists of red flags  
11 or potential red flags to the pharmacy industry?

12      **A**       Yes.

13      **Q**       Now, there may have been informal meetings and  
14 discussions on that subject?

15      **A**       Of course, there would have been formal or informal,  
16 yes.

17      **Q**       Okay. But am I right that these PDAC conferences  
18 beginning in 2011 were the first official effort to educate  
19 the pharmacy community on these potential red flags?

20                    MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

21                    THE COURT: Overruled.

22      **A**       Yes.

23      **Q**       In these presentations, did you discuss the opioid  
24 epidemic?

25      **A**       Yes.

1       **Q**     Okay. In your opinion, is there an opioid epidemic?

2       **A**     Yes.

3       **Q**     Is your opinion based on a particular Government  
4 announcement, or something else?

5       **A**     My opinion is based on the particular Government  
6 announcement at the time.

7       **Q**     What announcement?

8       **A**     In February of 2011, the CDC publicly stated that the  
9 United States was in the grips of an opioid epidemic. And  
10 then in April of 2011, the administration unveiled their  
11 Prescription Drug Abuse Prevention Plan.

12      **Q**     So do you key the opioid epidemic to 2011-ish?

13      **A**     Yes, as an official epidemic, yes.

14      **Q**     Is that to say that people weren't struggling and  
15 suffering and dying before then?

16      **A**     Oh, they were before that, yes.

17      **Q**     Mr. Hill, I noticed in some of your presentations  
18 there's images, like firearms, and you analogize them to  
19 prescription drugs.

20      **A**     That's correct.

21      **Q**     Can you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury what  
22 you were trying to communicate when you spoke about these  
23 issues?

24      **A**     Well, yes. First of all, with firearms, you should  
25 always assume that a firearm is loaded, so you always treat

1       it as if it's loaded and that it could cause harm, so you  
2       need to be careful with it.

3           So I would analogize prescription drugs under that  
4       analogy, that if you are not careful with prescription drugs  
5       and if you do not, you know, use them in the correct manner,  
6       they could be harmful and dangerous, just like a loaded  
7       weapon.

8       **Q**       Okay. Mr. Hill, I want to talk before we move on, and  
9       we'll try to do this quickly and just do a sampling, some of  
10      the -- well, have you given presentations apart from the  
11      PDAC conferences?

12      **A**       Yes.

13      **Q**       And how many of these PDAC conferences do you recall  
14      giving to pharmacists and pharmacy registrants?

15      **A**       That I participated in?

16      **Q**       Correct.

17      **A**       Approximately five of them.

18      **Q**       Okay. Did you give presentations on prescription drug  
19      diversion and related issues to foreign governments?

20      **A**       Yes.

21      **Q**       Okay. I'm going to put up -- and this is a  
22      Demonstrative Exhibit. It's your CV, CVS Demo 02.

23           And I have highlighted here. Did you present to the  
24      Romanian Government Officials?

25      **A**       Yes, but that was not the first time I presented

1       overseas. If you look at the one above it, I did a  
2       presentation in Israel and Jerusalem. And that was on  
3       prescription drug abuse in the United States.

4       **Q**       How about looking a little further down. Mexican  
5       Government Officials in 2011?

6       **A**       Yes.

7       **Q**       Is that another presentation you gave?

8       **A**       Yes, on prescription drug abuse and illicit chemical  
9       trafficking in the United States.

10      **Q**       Okay. Did you present to any members of Congress?

11      **A**       Yes.

12      **Q**       Okay. Did you present to any members of Congress from  
13       Ohio?

14      **A**       Yes. Mr. Joyce.

15      **Q**       Who's Mr. Joyce?

16      **A**       He is the Congressional Representative for the 14th  
17       District.

18      **Q**       And what does the 14th District include?

19      **A**       It includes Lake, Trumbull, Summit, Cuyahoga, and I  
20       think the other county is pronounced maybe "Geauga" or  
21       Geauga. And then there's another one that I can't pronounce  
22       that it covers a part of it too.

23      **Q**       Is it Ashtabula?

24      **A**       Yes, sir, that's it.

25      **Q**       Mr. Lanier started singing a song about that about two

1 hours ago.

2 **A** Okay. That's it.

3 **Q** And it's not all of Cuyahoga or Summit, right?

4 **A** No, his district is just partial of those counties.

5 **Q** How did that come about?

6 **A** I was giving a presentation, it was the Federal  
7 response to the heroin epidemic to members of Congress and  
8 their staff. And he was a part of it, so he later  
9 approached me to ask me would I give a presentation, that he  
10 was putting on a conference for the northeast Ohio elected  
11 officials.

12 **Q** And what was the subject matter of your presentation  
13 at that conference?

14 **A** It was on prescription drug abuse and the circle of  
15 addiction.

16 **Q** And you talk about in a lot of these presentations  
17 prescription drug abuse.

18 What do you mean by that?

19 **A** Prescription drug abuse means when a prescription drug  
20 is used for a not legitimate purpose. And what I mean by  
21 that is that you're using it not followed by the therapeutic  
22 value that it's supposed to be stated to be using.

23 So an example of that would be if the doctor or the  
24 practitioner that writes you the script says take one every  
25 4 hours or every 6 hours, but you say I'm going to take

1 three or four of them every 4 or 6 hours.

2 **Q** What if someone takes pills from the prescription  
3 bottle of their parent out of the medicine cabinet? Would  
4 that fall within the umbrella of prescription drug abuse  
5 that you were presenting about?

6 **A** Yes, because if you're taking a prescription drug that  
7 was not written for you as the end user, that's misuse and  
8 diversion.

9 **Q** Did you make presentations to law enforcement?

10 **A** Yes.

11 **Q** Okay. Here, and I don't know if this is quite law  
12 enforcement because it's lawyers, but here's one. The U.S.  
13 Attorney's Office, Western District of Pennsylvania,  
14 Prescription Drug Abuse Summit, 2012.

15 What was that presentation?

16 **A** That was a presentation to address the prescription  
17 drug abuse problems and trends that were going on in the  
18 United States, and it's also what was being seen in that  
19 district.

20 **Q** What's the U.S. Attorney's Office?

21 **A** The U.S. Attorney's Office is the office where the  
22 U.S. Attorney is the chief law enforcement officer for  
23 whatever district that that U.S. Attorney's Office is in.

24 So --

25 **Q** I'm sorry. Keep going.

1       **A**     So when you think of U.S. Attorneys, you would think  
2     of them as also being like prosecutors.

3       **Q**     They're lawyers?

4       **A**     Yes.

5       **Q**     Sorry.

6       **A**     Some of them are.

7       **Q**     When DEA brings a case in court, for either civil  
8     penalties or a criminal case, does it work with the U.S.  
9     Attorney's Offices?

10      **A**     It works with the U.S. Attorney's Office as well as it  
11     could work with a state prosecutor's office as well.

12      **Q**     A little further down it looks like you gave a talk to  
13     the West Virginia State Police Academy in 2012.

14           Do you recall that?

15      **A**     Yes.

16      **Q**     And what did that concern?

17      **A**     That concerned prescription drug abuse and trends.  
18     And what that was, the state of West Virginia had reached  
19     out and wanted DEA to come out and train and make their  
20     narcotics units available on what we were seeing with  
21     prescription drug abuse throughout the United States, and to  
22     help them.

23      **Q**     Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) National Academy  
24     class, what was that presentation?

25      **A**     That was on prescription drug abuse and trends also.

1       **Q**       And it looks like you gave this presentation to FBI  
2       classes routinely over the years.

3       **A**       Yes. What the FBI National Academy classes are, they  
4       are an Academy class where the upper echelon of police  
5       departments throughout the United States get selected to be  
6       trained at the FBI Academy for I believe it's 12 weeks, and  
7       so that way it makes them better executives.

8       **Q**       Did you ever present, other than the PDAC conferences,  
9       to pharmacists or pharmacy students?

10      **A**       Yes.

11      **Q**       Do you recall any of those presentations?

12      **A**       Yes.

13      **Q**       Where were they?

14      **A**       In California I spoke at a college of pharmacy there,  
15       at two different schools. I spoke at different pharmacy  
16       associations throughout the United States, in Michigan, in  
17       Nevada, and -- Michigan, Nevada. I believe somewhere, like  
18       maybe Boston, Massachusetts, or somewhere there.

19                  And I spoke for the Tennessee Department of Health for  
20       all their healthcare employees. I was speaking at a lot of  
21       locations.

22      **Q**       And did those presentations to pharmacists concern  
23       presentations on corresponding responsibility?

24      **A**       Yes.

25      **Q**       After you retired from DEA in 2014, what did you do

1 next?

2 **A** After I retired from DEA in 2014, I took a job with  
3 Amneal Pharmaceuticals.

4 **Q** What is Amneal Pharmaceuticals?

5 **A** They are a manufacturer of controls and noncontrol  
6 drugs.

7 **Q** Okay. And what was your role for Amneal  
8 Pharmaceuticals?

9 **A** I was the director of DEA Compliance and Corporate  
10 Security.

11 **Q** For how long did you work there?

12 **A** Approximately three and a half years.

13 **Q** And what were your responsibilities? What was your  
14 charge at Amneal Pharmaceuticals?

15 **A** My charge was to ensure that any of the Amneal  
16 locations that were authorized to handle controlled  
17 substances were in compliance with the CSA, its implementing  
18 regulations, which is the CFR, as well as state and local  
19 narcotic statutes for handling controlled substances.

20 **Q** What kind of prescription drugs did Amneal make?

21 **A** Amneal made prescription drugs from all gamuts, from  
22 controlled drugs to noncontrolled drugs.

23 **Q** Did Amneal manufacturer prescription opioids?

24 **A** Yes.

25 **Q** What kind of noncontrolled drugs did Amneal

1 manufacture when you were there?

2 **A** Like diabetes medications, blood pressure medications.

3 I believe like penicillins, kind of the standard

4 noncontrols.

5 **Q** Do you recall what percentage of Amneal's business was  
6 a controlled substance versus a noncontrol?

7 **A** Yes. It would range anywhere from, like 12 percent to  
8 20 percent, 25 percent.

9 **Q** Did you work for free for Amneal?

10 **A** No, I did not.

11 **Q** Did they compensate you?

12 **A** That's correct.

13 **Q** And there was a bonus plan?

14 **A** Yes.

15 **Q** Did you get bonuses under that plan?

16 **A** Yes.

17 **Q** Was there anything improper about that?

18 **A** No.

19 **Q** Can you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury why  
20 you moved from DEA after your retirement to Amneal?

21 **A** A former DEA employee had reached out to me and asked  
22 me if I would be interested in coming to Amneal to help them  
23 make sure that their program was good and in compliance.

24 And at first I told him no, and then later on I  
25 thought about it and said, you know, you always as a

1       Government employee kind of have in the back of your mind,  
2       could you succeed in private industry.

3           So after I told him no, I kind of thought about it  
4       and, as I said, I wondered if I could succeed in private  
5       industry, so then I decided to do it.

6   **Q**       Did the CEO, the chief executive of Amneal, give you  
7       any instructions upon being hired?

8   **A**       Yes.

9   **Q**       What were his instructions to you?

10   **A**       To ensure that all of Amneal facilities that were  
11       handling controlled substances were as compliant as they  
12       could possibly be.

13   **Q**       For how long were you at Amneal?

14   **A**       Approximately three and a half years.

15   **Q**       When did you retire?

16   **A**       I wouldn't say I retired. I just -- I left because I  
17       got tired of the commute and everything. So I decided to  
18       resign, which would have been July 18 of 2018.

19   **Q**       Okay. And let's tell the ladies and gentlemen of the  
20       jury about that before we get to your opinions.

21           You were living in northern Virginia at the time?

22   **A**       Yes, and my family was still there, yes.

23   **Q**       Your son and your wife are there, correct?

24   **A**       Yes.

25   **Q**       And is my memory right that Amneal was headquartered

1       in New Jersey or Long Island?

2       **A**       Their headquarters were in New Jersey, but I would  
3           spend a lot of time up in New York and New Jersey.

4       **Q**       So it was a really uncomfortable commute?

5       **A**       Yes, it was. If you're going from Virginia to  
6           Brookhaven, if anybody has ever done that drive, it could be  
7           an 8 to 10-hour drive.

8       **Q**       Now, Mr. Hill, has CVS, through me, I guess, engaged  
9           you to provide expert opinions in this case?

10      **A**       Yes.

11      **Q**       Are the opinions you're about to give yours or CVS's?

12      **A**       They're my opinions.

13      **Q**       When did CVS first retain you in connection with  
14           opioid litigations?

15      **A**       It would have been in September of 2018.

16      **Q**       When did you begin working on this particular case?

17      **A**       It would have been January of 2021.

18      **Q**       Did you write a report in this case?

19      **A**       Yes, I did.

20      **Q**       Approximately how long is that report, if you  
21           remember?

22      **A**       Approximately 46 pages.

23      **Q**       Have you been deposed in this case?

24      **A**       Yes.

25      **Q**       Okay. How many hours have you devoted to the

1 preparation of your opinions in connection with your  
2 engagement by CVS?

3 **A** When you're asking hours, are you asking hours since  
4 January?

5 **Q** Do you recall since January? Why don't you just do  
6 the whole since 2018.

7 **A** Since 2018, the hours that I've worked is  
8 approximately 1,029 hours.

9 **Q** And has that included reviewing documents?

10 **A** Yes.

11 **Q** Reviewing testimony?

12 **A** Yes.

13 **Q** Reviewing laws?

14 **A** Yes.

15 **Q** Preparing your opinions?

16 **A** Yes.

17 **Q** Writing reports?

18 **A** Yes.

19 **Q** And testifying?

20 **A** Yes.

21 **Q** Okay. Like every expert witness who's appeared in  
22 this trial so far, you're being paid, right?

23 **A** Yes.

24 **Q** How much have you received on your time thus far?

25 **A** For overall since 2018?

1   **Q**   Correct, overall.

2   **A**   Approximately \$361,000.

3   **Q**   Okay. Who do you submit your bills to?

4   **A**   Doerr, which is now they have a subsidiary company  
5                 which is WIT Legal.

6   **Q**   WIT, W-I-T, right?

7   **A**   That's correct.

8   **Q**   Is WIT a company that represents experts like you?

9   **A**   Yes.

10   **Q**   How did you come into contact with Doerr or WIT, or  
11                 whatever it was called at the time?

12   **A**   Someone had reached out to me and asked me if I would  
13                 talk to them because they were looking for some experts, and  
14                 so I said, sure, I'll talk to them. And they subsequently  
15                 called me.

16   **Q**   Okay. And is it -- is WIT the company that connected  
17                 us?

18   **A**   Well, it was Doerr originally, and now it's WIT.

19   **Q**   Okay. So was it Doerr who connected us?

20   **A**   Yes.

21   **Q**   Okay. Let's just call it WIT since there was a change  
22                 in name.

23   **A**   Right.

24   **Q**   Has WIT played any role whatsoever in the preparation  
25                 of your opinions?

1      **A**      No.

2      **Q**      Has WIT played any role whatsoever in your testimony  
3                in any fashion?

4      **A**      No.

5      **Q**      Does WIT process your bills?

6      **A**      Yes.

7      **Q**      Does WIT prepare the engagement paperwork, like  
8                engagement letters?

9      **A**      Yes.

10     **Q**      Does WIT play any other role whatsoever in the  
11                preparation of your opinions and your testimony here today?

12     **A**      No.

13     **Q**      Okay. What's your hourly rate, Mr. Hill?

14     **A**      My hourly rate is \$400 an hour.

15     **Q**      Is that the rate charged to CVS?

16     **A**      No, it's not.

17     **Q**      What's the rate charged to CVS?

18     **A**      \$675.

19     **Q**      And what happens to the portion of that rate above  
20                400?

21     **A**      That goes to WIT Legal.

22     **Q**      Okay. Moving to your opinions, Mr. Hill, what are  
23                your opinions primarily based on?

24     **A**      My 25-plus years as a DEA special agent.

25     **Q**      Have you also re-reviewed laws and regulations?

1      **A**      Yes.

2      **Q**      Have you looked at documents?

3      **A**      Yes.

4      **Q**      Have you reviewed testimony?

5      **A**      Yes.

6      **Q**      Deposition testimony?

7      **A**      Yes.

8      **Q**      And are you certain of the opinions you're going to  
9                give today to a reasonable degree of probability?

10     **A**      Yes.

11     **Q**      Okay. All right. I hope the wind-up wasn't too long.

12     Let's move to your opinions.

13     Mr. Hill.

14     **A**      Yes.

15     **Q**      In your opinion, do most doctors write controlled  
16                substance prescriptions for legitimate medical reasons?

17     **A**      Yes.

18     **Q**      What's the basis of your opinion?

19     **A**      The basis for my opinions is several things. It's the  
20                official information that DEA has put out regarding  
21                practitioners writing prescriptions.

22     **Q**      Mr. Hill, are you familiar with a 2006 public notice  
23                that DEA published in the Federal Register regarding the  
24                prescribing of pain medication?

25     **A**      Yes.

1 Q Does that DEA notice supply one of the bases for your  
2 opinion that doctors write controlled substances for  
3 legitimate medical reasons?

4      **A**      Yes.

5 MR. DELINSKY: I'm showing Mr. Hill Defendant  
6 MDL-1096.

7 Q Mr. Hill, I'm sorry. Is this exhibit the notice that  
8 we just talked about that DEA issued?

9      **A**      Yes.

10 Q Okay. And Mr. Hill, I'm turning to the page in the  
11 top right-hand corner 52719.

12           Do you want me to read the exhibit number to you  
13 again?

**A** Well, yeah, because I don't see it here, so...

15 | Oh, okay. Thank you.

16 | o And again, top right corner, 52719.

17 A Yes.

18      8      All right. And I'd just like to highlight.

19           Do you see where it says, "The number of physicians  
20 who prescribe controlled substances in violation of the CSA  
21 is extremely small."

Do you see that language?

23      **A**           Yes, sir.

24 Q And below, it says, "DEA recognizes that the  
25 overwhelming majority of American physicians who prescribe

1 controlled substances do so for legitimate medical  
2 purposes."

3 Do you see that?

4 **A** Yes.

5 **Q** "In fact, the overwhelming majority of physicians who  
6 prescribe controlled substances do so in a legitimate manner  
7 that will never warrant scrutiny by federal or state law  
8 enforcement officials."

9 Do you see that?

10 **A** Yes.

11 **Q** Are these statements part of the bases of your  
12 opinion?

13 **A** Yes.

14 **Q** If you could turn to page 52721.

15 We're on the same document, right, Mr. Hill?

16 **A** That's correct.

17 **Q** And here DEA says, "The agency recognizes that nearly  
18 every prescription issued by a physician in the United  
19 States is for a legitimate medical purpose in the usual  
20 course of professional practice."

21 Do you see that?

22 **A** Yes.

23 **Q** Is that a basis of your opinion?

24 **A** Yes.

25 **Q** Do you agree with that statement?

1       **A**       Yes.

2       **Q**       Now, Mr. Hill, this publication came out in 2006 by  
3       DEA, correct?

4       **A**       Correct.

5       **Q**       Has DEA deviated from that position over the years?

6       **A**       No, it has not.

7       **Q**       Has that position remained consistent over the years?

8       **A**       Yes.

9       **Q**       Okay. Without going through all the instances when  
10      DEA has repeated that, do you recall reviewing testimony to  
11      Congress by acting administrator of the DEA, Mr. Patterson?

12      **A**       Yes.

13      **Q**       And I'm showing you what's been marked as  
14      DEF-MDL-01482.

15      **A**       Okay. I have it open, sir.

16      **Q**       Okay. And is this the testimony you recall reviewing?

17      **A**       Yes.

18      **Q**       When was this testimony provided?

19      **A**       It was provided on May 8 of 2018.

20      **Q**       Okay. And I'm showing you page 32.

21                  Do you see page 32?

22      **A**       Yes, sir.

23      **Q**       And this is where Mr. Patterson says, in sworn  
24      testimony to Congress, "I look at the vast majority of  
25      doctors: 99.99 percent are all trying to do right by their

1 patients."

2 Do you see that testimony?

3 **A** Yes.

4 **Q** Did you rely on that testimony in preparing your  
5 opinions?

6 **A** Yes.

7 **Q** Do you agree with that testimony?

8 **A** Yes.

9 **Q** Mr. Hill, does this mean that it is appropriate for  
10 pharmacists to fill the vast majority of controlled  
11 substances prescriptions?

12 **A** Yes.

13 **Q** Next opinion, okay? And this opinion concerns the  
14 volume of prescriptions.

15 Who is responsible for the volume of prescriptions  
16 that are written for prescription opioid medications?

17 **A** Practitioners or other medical professionals.

18 **Q** Okay. Let's stop there.

19 Can you put in lay terms what practitioners and  
20 medical professionals are?

21 **A** Yes. Doctors, and you may have some other professions  
22 where nurses may be able to do it, depending on what state  
23 they're in.

24 **Q** Can we just use "doctors" as shorthand?

25 **A** Yes.

1       **Q**       So is it your testimony that doctors are responsible  
2       for the volume of prescriptions that are written for  
3       prescription opioids in the United States?

4       **A**       Yes.

5       **Q**       Do pharmacists or pharmacies play any role in how many  
6       prescriptions are written?

7       **A**       No.

8       **Q**       Are pharmacists allowed to write prescriptions for  
9       controlled substances?

10      **A**       No.

11      **Q**       Next set of opinions, Mr. Hill.

12                  This concerns corresponding responsibility. And I  
13       think you have a few opinions on this that we'll walk  
14       through, but let's start -- I want to ask you what  
15       corresponding responsibility is, but let's do it in this  
16       fashion.

17                  And I'm showing you and the Court what has been marked  
18       as, and I believe admitted, as P-8163.

19      **A**       Yes, I have it open.

20      **Q**       Do you recognize P-8163?

21      **A**       Yes.

22      **Q**       What is it?

23      **A**       That is C.F.R. 1306.04, which deals with the purpose  
24       in the issue of a prescription.

25      **Q**       Is this the regulation that sets forth a pharmacist's

1 corresponding responsibility?

2 **A** Yes.

3 **Q** I'd like to direct your attention to the sentence I'm  
4 highlighting that says, "A person knowingly filling such a  
5 purported prescription, as well as the person issuing it,  
6 shall be subject to the penalties provided for violations of  
7 the provisions of law relating to controlled substances."

8 **A** Yes, I see that.

9 **Q** Okay. What is the meaning of this provision?

10 **A** The meaning of this provision means that a pharmacist  
11 cannot knowingly fill an illegitimate prescription. And if  
12 they do, they would be subject to sanction, either through  
13 criminal charges or administrative, but it would make them  
14 exposed to it.

15 **Q** Okay. And is that the corresponding responsibility  
16 obligation of a pharmacist?

17 **A** Yes.

18 **Q** Okay. For there to be a violation of corresponding  
19 responsibility, must the prescription be illegitimate?

20 MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

21 **A** Yes.

22 THE COURT: Well, hold it.

23 THE WITNESS: Sorry.

24 THE COURT: Overruled.

25 **Q** Let's go through it one more time just for clarity of

1       the record, okay, Mr. Hill?

2       **A**       Okay.

3                    MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, can we be heard  
4       on the --

5                    THE COURT: Well, all right.

6                    (At side bar at 2:57 p.m.)

7                    MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, I thought the  
8       rules that we've been following throughout this trial is  
9       that witnesses cannot testify what is a violation of the  
10      law.

11                  MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, I think we've got  
12      lots of testimony on that from Carmen Catizone, Joe  
13      Rannazzisi. They've put their spin on what they believe the  
14      legal requirements are. I'm happy to couch it in terms of  
15      based on his experience and background if that moves the  
16      ball.

17                  THE COURT: All right. I think the proper  
18      question is what DEA advised people when he's there. He's  
19      qualified to testify to that. But you're right, he can't  
20      just get up and say this is what the law is.

21                  MR. DELINSKY: Okay. Understood, Your Honor.

22                  MR. WEINBERGER: Well, Your Honor, can we have  
23      a -- I mean, you've said repeatedly that --

24                  THE COURT: Mr. Delinsky, why don't you go  
25      back and reask the question, all right?

1                   MR. DELINSKY: The same way or your way, Your  
2 Honor?

3                   THE COURT: My way.

4                   MR. DELINSKY: Yes, absolutely.

5                   (In open court at 2:59 p.m.)

6 BY MR. DELINSKY:

7       **Q**       Mr. Hill, based on your experience at DEA and based on  
8 what DEA advised registrants, for there to be a violation of  
9 corresponding responsibility, must the prescription itself  
10 be illegitimate to begin with?

11                  MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

12                  THE COURT: Yeah, I'll sustain that.

13       **Q**       Mr. Hill, based on your experience, do you have a view  
14 as to whether a violation of corresponding responsibility  
15 can be established in the absence of an illegitimate  
16 prescription?

17       **A**       Without an illegitimate prescription, there's no  
18 corresponding responsibility that has to be invoked.

19       **Q**       And when you say no corresponding responsibility, you  
20 mean no corresponding responsibility violation in your  
21 experience and in your opinion?

22                  MR. WEINBERGER: Objection. Leading.

23                  THE COURT: I'm going to sustain that.

24       **Q**       Okay. Mr. Hill, what does it mean for a prescription  
25 to be illegitimate?

1                   MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

2                   (At side bar at 3:00 p.m.)

3                   MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, we have had  
4 plaintiff expert after plaintiff experts, including medical  
5 doctors, opine on what pharmacists have to do and what are  
6 the rules --

7                   THE COURT: Wait a minute. We've had  
8 pharmacists talk about it, we've had doctors talk about it.  
9 He's neither a pharmacist nor a doctor.

10                  MR. DELINSKY: But he's Drug Enforcement.

11                  THE COURT: Well, if you want to ask him, you  
12 know, what DEA pronouncements were or what DEA's advice to  
13 pharmacists were, that's fine. But you can't just get him  
14 up there and say, well, it's --

15                  MR. WEINBERGER: I think that violates the  
16 *Touhy* letter that --

17                  THE COURT: I'm concerned about all that, too.

18                  MR. WEINBERGER: He can testify about his  
19 understanding, but he can't testify on behalf of the DEA.

20                  MR. DELINSKY: Okay. I'll qualify it that  
21 way.

22                  THE COURT: I don't know what he's --

23                  MR. DELINSKY: I'll qualify it to his  
24 understanding and his experience.

25                  THE COURT: His understanding, his experience,

1       when he was there, because that's what it's limited to.

2                   MR. DELINSKY: Okay. Yup.

3                   (In open court at 3:01 p.m.)

4       BY MR. DELINSKY:

5       **Q**       Mr. Hill, based on your understanding and your  
6       experience while you were at DEA, what is your understanding  
7       of what an illegitimate prescription is?

8       **A**       An illegitimate prescription is a prescription that  
9       was not written for a valid reason.

10      **Q**       Okay. And when you say valid reason, do you mean a  
11       valid medical reason?

12      **A**       Yes.

13      **Q**       Okay. And based on your experience in your time at  
14       DEA, and your understanding, is it your opinion that a  
15       prescription must be illegitimate for there to be a  
16       corresponding responsibility violation?

17                  MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

18                  THE COURT: Sustained.

19      **Q**       Let's move on.

20                  THE COURT: It's time for a break if we're  
21       moving to a new subject.

22                  MR. DELINSKY: Yeah, that's fine, Your Honor.

23                  THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we'll take  
24       our mid afternoon recess. Usual admonitions apply. 15  
25       minutes, and then we'll pick up with more of Mr. Hill's

1 testimony.

2 (The jury is not present.)

3 MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, we sat through  
4 hours of testimony of witnesses opining on the law. If  
5 there was any lesson from plaintiffs' case, it was if there  
6 is a red flag, there is a legal obligation to resolve it.  
7 That came out of the mouth of expert witness after expert  
8 witness and out of the mouths of fact witnesses. And I do  
9 believe it's unfair to limit the defense from eliciting  
10 opinions in that same general universe.

11 And just because the opinion doesn't track exactly  
12 with plaintiffs' opinion but comes at it a different way  
13 does not make it of a different ilk or a different category.

14 If these legal issues have been litigated, it's been a  
15 little of an unusual feature of this case, but it's  
16 difficult to say that plaintiffs were allowed to do it and  
17 the defendants can't now --

18 THE COURT: Mr. Delinsky, it's not that you're  
19 not allowed to do it. It's what you're trying to bring out  
20 with this witness. I mean, a pharmacist can get on and say  
21 from my understanding, this is my legal responsibility as a  
22 pharmacist. A doctor can do that. He's neither.

23 MR. LANIER: Your Honor, toward that end, I'd  
24 like the record to reflect that Dr. Wailes got to testify on  
25 this regard for the defendants. Tony Villanueva, Captain

1 Villanueva, was not allowed to testify on this because he  
2 wasn't any of those things.

3 MR. DELINSKY: But, Your Honor, this man ran  
4 the unit at DEA that investigated pharmacies. He was at DEA  
5 enforcing these laws for 25 years. He taught pharmacists.

6 THE COURT: But wait a minute, if you want to  
7 ask him what position DEA took in enforcement actions, I  
8 guess you can ask it that way. I'm just -- he's neither,  
9 he's neither a doctor nor is he a pharmacist. And so he  
10 can't testify to what he does or what his understanding of  
11 the law is in his practice, like other pharmacists have and  
12 other doctors have.

13 MR. DELINSKY: But he's a law enforcement --  
14 he's law enforcement.

15 THE COURT: As I said, he can testify to the  
16 position that he took and DEA took up until 2014 in  
17 enforcing the law.

18 MR. DELINSKY: So can I ask "When you were  
19 enforcing the Controlled Substances Act, did you, was it  
20 your understanding, your and DEA's understanding?"

21 MR. WEINBERGER: He can't testify -- the *Touhy*  
22 authorization does not permit him to testify about what  
23 DEA's position was.

24 MR. DELINSKY: Well, Joe Rannazzisi did.  
25 That's the problem. There's an inequity here.

1                   THE COURT: I don't know what everyone's *Touhy*  
2 letters said. Do we have someone from the DOJ here?

3                   MR. WEINBERGER: Well, we have the *Touhy*  
4 letter.

5                   MR. DELINSKY: We told them time and time  
6 again that Mr. Hill was testifying. They're not here.

7                   MR. LANIER: The DEA specifically disavows  
8 what this gentleman has said in his report and in his  
9 testimony.

10                  MR. DELINSKY: Yeah, just as they did to Joe  
11 Rannazzisi.

12                  MR. LANIER: No.

13                  MR. WEINBERGER: Joe Rannazzisi didn't issue a  
14 report. He's not an expert in this case. And he's a  
15 pharmacist and a lawyer.

16                  THE COURT: He's not received authorization  
17 for this report or any future testimony.

18                  MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, that applied to his  
19 deposition.

20                  MR. WEINBERGER: No.

21                  THE COURT: Guess what, this applies to  
22 everything.

23                  MR. DELINSKY: But, Your Honor, we have  
24 provided them ample notice and submitted, told them that  
25 we're providing this testimony, and they have provided no

1 response.

2 MR. WEINBERGER: This is the response.

3 MR. DELINSKY: No, this is -- we've told them  
4 about their trial testimony.

5 Look, Your Honor, I'm happy to move on.

6 THE COURT: All right. I'll tell you what,  
7 you can elicit this testimony, but I'll let the plaintiffs  
8 read this *Touhy* letter and say the DEA is expressly  
9 disavowing everything this man says. All right, that's  
10 fine. It's fair game both ways.

11 MR. DELINSKY: Then we want to put in the  
12 *Touhy* letters that have been provided on Joe Rannazzisi as  
13 well.

14 THE COURT: Did they expressly disavow and  
15 reject everything he said?

16 MR. LANIER: No.

17 MR. DELINSKY: I'd like to see the letter. I  
18 just can't recall before his deposition.

19 THE COURT: Well, I mean, if they did, I'm  
20 sure you would have put it in.

21 MR. DELINSKY: I guess we object --

22 THE COURT: I mean, you want to start --  
23 that's fine, I said that attacking the Federal Government is  
24 fair game. It's wide open. FDA, DEA, whatever. So --

25 MR. DELINSKY: We're not attacking the Federal

1       Government, Your Honor.

2                     THE COURT: Mr. Delinsky, you want -- if you  
3       want him to opine as to what he did and what his  
4       understanding of the law was at DEA, that's fine, and I will  
5       certainly let the plaintiffs put into evidence this letter  
6       and cross-examine him on it.

7                     MR. DELINSKY: That's fine, Your Honor.

8                     THE COURT: The DEA expressly disavows.

9                     MR. DELINSKY: I'm just putting on the record  
10      that if there was a double standard, this is it.

11                    MR. LANIER: And I'm putting on the record  
12      that Captain Villanueva --

13                    THE COURT: There isn't a double standard.

14                    MR. DELINSKY: There is a double standard. We  
15      had witness upon witness upon witness upon witness in  
16      plaintiffs' case opining on the law without threat of  
17      boilerplate, and *Touhy* regulations were used. And that's  
18      just the fact of it. And if those are the rules of the  
19      case, those are the rules of the case. We'll move on. But  
20      I want the objection noted. That's all.

21                    MR. WEINBERGER: We didn't call a DEA witness  
22      as an expert.

23                    THE COURT: Right. This is different. You've  
24      called him as an expert.

25                    MR. DELINSKY: So the rules pertaining to a

1 fact witness are more liberal than an expert witness? That  
2 makes no sense. It's not right.

3 MR. WEINBERGER: We didn't ask him opinion  
4 testimony.

5 MR. DELINSKY: Of course you did. How many  
6 times --

7 MR. WEINBERGER: Please don't yell at me.

8 THE COURT: Look, Mr. Delinsky, I will permit  
9 you -- you called him as an expert on DEA policy, okay? The  
10 plaintiffs didn't, you know, file a *Daubert* motion, so he's  
11 qualified to testify to what DEA enforcement policy was over  
12 25 years. I have no doubt about that. And he can do that.

13 And so you can ask him as long as you couch the  
14 questions that way, you can ask those questions. But the  
15 plaintiffs can certainly bring out to impeach him that DEA  
16 is expressly disavowing everything he says. All right?

17 So and then you can cross -- you know, you can try and  
18 rehabilitate him if you want, but that's -- basically this  
19 letter says that they -- they're saying that DEA does not  
20 endorse any of his opinions, and any of his opinions do not  
21 reflect the opinions of the Department or DEA.

22 So that's fine, but the jury will take it for  
23 whatever -- they'll put the weight on it.

24 MR. DELINSKY: But, Your Honor, here's the  
25 problem. That is a form letter that is provided that has

1       been given to every DEA -- former DEA official who has  
2       testified as an expert in this case.

3                   THE COURT: That's the first one that's been  
4       presented to --

5                   MR. DELINSKY: What if we show you that the  
6       letter that was written -- I'm sorry, the *Touhy* response  
7       that was written for Mr. Rafalski, who was plaintiffs' DEA  
8       expert that they didn't call, they're all the same. So this  
9       is using legalese and boilerplate to impeach a witness and  
10      it's not fair. That's what they say for everyone. That's  
11      nothing personal to Mr. Hill.

12                  MR. WEINBERGER: We didn't call Mr. Rafalski  
13      as an expert.

14                  MR. DELINSKY: But you used him throughout the  
15      litigation and you've called him in other cases.

16                  MR. LANIER: I have not.

17                  MR. DELINSKY: You haven't, Mark, you're  
18      right.

19                  THE COURT: You called this man as a DEA  
20      expert, all right? That's different. So that's fine,  
21      you're allowed to have a DEA expert. And I will allow him  
22      to answer questions based on his 25 years expertise. But  
23      then he can be cross-examined on the fact that DEA is saying  
24      that his opinions aren't theirs.

25                  And if you want to ask him, well, isn't this a form

1 letter they give to everyone, and if he knows that, he can  
2 say that. Maybe it is. I don't know.

3 MR. DELINSKY: Understood, Your Honor. My  
4 objection's noted.

5 MR. STOFFELMAYR: Judge, may I ask a question  
6 just for my understanding?

7 THE COURT: Go ahead.

8 MR. STOFFELMAYR: Mr. Rannazzisi answered  
9 many, many questions termed, you know, "Was it DEA's  
10 understanding that" blank, legal conclusion. Would that be  
11 permissible? Because whether he's a fact witness or an  
12 expert witness, this man would know as well as  
13 Mr. Rannazzisi --

14 THE COURT: Yes, I'm allowing -- I am allowing  
15 him -- I mean, whether he's a fact witness or an expert, he  
16 could testify to what DEA policy was during that 25 years,  
17 all right? He can testify to that.

18 MR. WEINBERGER: I actually think he was --  
19 the questions that were asked of him by us was what is your  
20 understanding, because you objected to him speaking as the  
21 DEA.

22 MR. DELINSKY: I mean, Your Honor, I assume  
23 you will let me introduce then the Touhy letters written on  
24 behalf of -- you know, in regards to Joe Rannazzisi,  
25 Mr. Prevoznik, Ms. Ashley, all the other DEA people who have

1 provided testimony.

2 MR. WEINBERGER: We didn't call Prevoznik.

3 MR. DELINSKY: Don't matter. This is

4 boilerplate, Your Honor. You're allowing --

5 THE COURT: I don't know if it's boilerplate.

6 MR. DELINSKY: Well, what if we show you it

7 is? It's just not fair.

8 MR. WEINBERGER: It isn't. You submitted his  
9 report to them for a *Touhy* authorization for him to testify  
10 at trial, and this was their response.

11 MR. DELINSKY: That's what they respond to  
12 everybody, every single person.

13 MR. WEINBERGER: Ashley is not an expert.  
14 Prevoznik is not an expert. They didn't submit expert  
15 reports.

16 MR. DELINSKY: We will show every single  
17 expert witness they include the exact same language, and  
18 that is form language, and it's unfair impeachment. It's  
19 out of bounds. And it can't be, Your Honor, it cannot be  
20 that an expert witness can be impeached on that due to the  
21 *Touhy* rules when a fact witness like Joe Rannazzisi can't  
22 be. That's a fundamental inequity.

23 THE COURT: Well, wait, no. There's a big  
24 difference, Mr. Delinsky. Fact witness, you know, you can  
25 do whatever you want. If he's an expert witness opining

1       on -- his expertise is what DEA did and didn't do and what  
2       their position was, then this specifically says it's not  
3       their opinion. That's the difference.

4                    MR. DELINSKY: But we weren't asking for DEA  
5       opinions. We wanted his opinions, Your Honor. We want to  
6       put this as his opinions. We didn't couch him in the report  
7       as DEA opinions. We couched them as his.

8                    THE COURT: But his opinion, is he worth  
9       anything unless he's a DEA expert?

10                  MR. DELINSKY: I don't believe that's right,  
11      Your Honor. I think his opinion is based on his experience  
12      at DEA, but it's an independent opinion.

13                  MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, this letter which  
14      you have, August 12, 2021, specifically says the DOJ  
15      received your e-mail -- this is to Kyle Crawford of  
16      Mr. Delinsky's firm, August 12.

17                  "We received your e-mail and letter containing the  
18      expert report of Robert Hill, former DEA employee, and  
19      reviewed that report. We understand Mr. Hill's report was  
20      served before it was provided to the DEA, and so this office  
21      and DEA did not have the opportunity to determine whether  
22      the information contained in the report could be shared  
23      pursuant to 28 C.F.R. 1621 to 1629, which are also known as  
24      *Touhy* regulations.

25                  "Accordingly, Mr. Hill did not receive authorization

1 under that section for his report or any future testimony.  
2 Nevertheless, this office on behalf of the DEA affirmatively  
3 states the DEA does not endorse any of the opinions  
4 contained in the report, and that the opinions expressed by  
5 Mr. Hill do not reflect the opinions of the Department or  
6 the DEA.

7 "Further, the DEA does not attest to the accuracy of  
8 the facts, data, or opinions in Mr. Hill's report or future  
9 testimony."

10 This was submitted to authorize him to testify per a  
11 report that they had never reviewed and gotten  
12 preauthorization for, to testify as an expert in this case.

13 That is not the case with respect to any of the fact  
14 witnesses that have DEA backgrounds.

15 MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, we have sent three  
16 e-mails this week alone to the Department of Justice to try  
17 to get approval for this testimony and to try to get them  
18 engaged, and they haven't been engaged.

19 MR. WEINBERGER: That's further evidence  
20 that --

21 THE COURT: It's a little late for that.

22 MR. DELINSKY: We told them before, Your  
23 Honor. We have been following up and following up and  
24 following up. We're not getting anything.

25 THE COURT: In August they said no. That

1       probably meant no.

2                    MR. DELINSKY: They didn't say no, they said  
3       they didn't endorse.

4                    Well, fine, Your Honor. Look, I'm just noting that  
5       it's unfair impeachment, the Court's imposing a double  
6       standard. I know I've lost. I accept it. I just want my  
7       objection noted on the record, that's all.

8                    MR. WEINBERGER: And plaintiffs need to state  
9       for the record, that's the risk that you took by hiring an  
10      expert who was a former DEA employee.

11                  MR. DELINSKY: Yeah, and the rules set forth,  
12      urged by plaintiffs and set forth by the Court, is if you  
13      pay -- if you have Mr. Rannazzisi and you pay his expenses  
14      to bring him here, he's providing expert testimony dressed  
15      up as a fact witness. But he gets to come here and  
16      essentially give expert testimony, that's okay because he  
17      gets to dodge the *Touhy* process. But if you do it the right  
18      way and you're intellectually honest about it, and you call  
19      it what it is, you get punished. And that's the rule.  
20      That's the rule. That's the rule.

21                  MR. LANIER: Without regard to being yelled at  
22      in the process of this from Mr. Delinsky, I will add the  
23      following: There were specific questions I tried to ask  
24      Mr. Rannazzisi that were deemed off limits because he wasn't  
25      an expert, and I was only allowed to ask him questions as a

1 fact witness in his role and what he did as a fact witness.

2 He is a pharmacist, he is a lawyer, and I was limited  
3 within the framework of that to those things because he  
4 didn't issue an expert report, and I didn't have him here as  
5 a retained expert. I wasn't allowed to pay for his time  
6 because he was a fact witness and not an expert.

7 I want the record clear.

8 MR. STOFFELMAYR: I want to make sure we're  
9 all working with the same facts. I have the Court's ruling,  
10 I looked this up, it's not complicated, because there was  
11 lots of debate about what Mr. Rannazzisi could or couldn't  
12 testify about.

13 And what the Court said is he can testify to his  
14 understanding, not what he thinks the rules are, his  
15 understanding -- good Lord -- of what the DEA's position was  
16 at the time. And there is no reason Mr. Hill couldn't give  
17 exactly the same testimony.

18 THE COURT: Well, Mr. Stoffelmayr, I said that  
19 Mr. Delinsky could ask those questions.

20 MR. DELINSKY: But you're erecting an  
21 impeachment, Your Honor, that only exists --

22 THE COURT: No. Hold it, hold it, hold it.  
23 Is there a letter that the DEA sent to the lawyers or to  
24 Mr. Rannazzisi like this?

25 MR. DELINSKY: No, because the process was

1 different because they didn't disclose him as an expert,  
2 Your Honor.

3 MR. LANIER: Your Honor, not only did we get a  
4 Touhy authorization for Mr. Rannazzisi to be here, but  
5 Mr. Bennett sat over there on behalf of the DOJ during the  
6 testimony.

7 THE COURT: I remember that.

8 MR. DELINSKY: And we begged him to be here,  
9 Your Honor. We sent Mr. Bennett e-mail after e-mail. It's  
10 not our fault that he's not engaging on this. And we can  
11 put all those --

12 THE COURT: I think the problem is that you've  
13 called him as an expert.

14 MR. DELINSKY: But as an expert based on his  
15 experience, Your Honor. You have tried to push me into  
16 saying "In your experience at DEA." That's the basis of his  
17 opinion, but his opinion is independent.

18 THE COURT: Well, the point is you could have  
19 just called him as a fact witness.

20 MR. DELINSKY: Well, why don't I do that now?

21 THE COURT: Well, you've paid him \$300,000.  
22 It's late.

23 MR. DELINSKY: Yeah, but the plaintiffs paid  
24 Rannazzisi \$900,000, Your Honor, not in this case, but other  
25 plaintiffs. That's a tricky line to navigate, Your Honor.

1                   THE COURT: Well, you could have brought that  
2 out if that was the case.

3                   MR. DELINSKY: We did.

4                   THE COURT: All right, fine. But he's not.

5                   MR. WEINBERGER: We didn't ask him expert  
6 opinions about the conduct of CVS --

7                   THE COURT: As I said, I am allowing -- the  
8 difference is you're calling him as an expert. So, fine,  
9 I'm allowing you to ask him those questions for -- based on  
10 his expertise and his knowledge what DEA policy was in those  
11 25 years, what positions they took in enforcement, what  
12 instructions they gave to pharmacists. You can ask him any  
13 of those questions. But they can bring out the fact that  
14 the Department of Justice says that they're not endorsing  
15 any of his opinions, okay? That's a fact.

16                  Now, that -- they're not saying that they're  
17 disavowing them, that he's wrong. They're just saying that  
18 they don't know and they're not endorsing any of his  
19 opinions, okay? It doesn't say his opinions are wrong or  
20 they're rejecting them. So you're not going to be able to  
21 imply that that's what the letter says, because it doesn't.

22                  MR. DELINSKY: Okay, Your Honor. I think what  
23 we'll do though is we will use that with Mr. Hill, over our  
24 objection, so that we are the ones presenting it.

25                  THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.

1 (Recess taken at 3:22 p.m.)

2 (Jury present in open court at 3:37 p.m.)

3 THE COURT: Please be seated, ladies and  
4 gentlemen. I apologize for that longer than usual break.  
5 We had some legal matters we needed to take up.

6 So, Mr. Hill, I want to remind you, you are still  
7 under oath, sir.

8           And Mr. Delinsky, you may proceed.

9                           MR. DELINSKY: I hope everyone had a good  
10 break.

11 BY MR. DELINSKY:

12 Q Let me just take a quick detour, Mr. Hill.

13           Remember we talked about how there's rules that guide  
14 your testimony and prohibit you from disclosing information  
15 that was internal to DEA, correct?

16 A Correct.

17      8      Do you understand those to be called Touhy rules?

18 | A Yes.

19 Q Okay. And you recall that my office, Mr. Crawford  
20 right there, sent a letter to DEA telling them about your  
21 testimony, correct?

22      **A**      Correct.

23 Q I want to go over the response with you that we  
24 received from the Department of Justice.

As you'll see, this is dated August 12, 2021.

1           You see that?

2   **A**    Yes, sir.

3   **Q**    Okay. And we're going to go through this.

4           By the way, for the record, this is P-23011.

5           Mr. Hill, you see it's signed on page 2 --

6           THE COURT: I thought it's P-21912.

7           MR. DELINSKY: I have 230 --

8           MR. LANIER: Your Honor, you have the  
9 plaintiffs' copy of the letter that I gave you during the  
10 break. This is --

11           MR. WEINBERGER: This is it. 23011.

12           MR. DELINSKY: You good, Your Honor?

13           THE COURT: I just want to know what -- mine  
14 has a different number, but whatever you've got it, fine.

15           MR. WEINBERGER: We had a different P number  
16 on ours.

17           THE COURT: All right.

18 BY MR. DELINSKY:

19   **Q**    Mr. Hill, do you see it's signed by Ava Rotell Dustin?

20   **A**    Yes.

21   **Q**    Do you know Miss Dustin?

22   **A**    No.

23   **Q**    Is she with DEA?

24   **A**    No.

25   **Q**    She's with the U.S. Attorney's Office here, correct?

1       **A**      Yes.

2       **Q**      That sometimes represents DEA or does represent DEA,  
3                    correct?

4       **A**      Yes.

5       **Q**      Now, Mr. Hill, we can see -- this is where I'm going  
6                    to highlight it. This says, "Mr. Hill is not authorized to  
7                    provide any information regarding any specific nonpublic DEA  
8                    investigation or activity."

9                    Do you see that?

10      **A**      Yes.

11      **Q**      Is that consistent with your understanding?

12      **A**      Yes, sir.

13      **Q**      "Classified and classifiable information," is that  
14                    consistent with your understanding?

15      **A**      Yes.

16      **Q**      Do you in fact possess classified information from  
17                    your time at DEA, Mr. Hill? Maybe, maybe not?

18      **A**      I guess it would be DEA classified, yes.

19      **Q**      And you understand you can't disclose it?

20      **A**      Yes.

21      **Q**      Mr. Hill, I want to show you something else and ask  
22                    you about it.

23                    Here it says, "This office," the U.S. Attorney's  
24                    Office, "on behalf of DEA affirmatively states that the DEA  
25                    does not endorse any of the opinions contained in the report

1 prepared by Mr. Hill."

2 Do you understand that language?

3 **A** Yes.

4 **Q** Would you expect to see that?

5 **A** Yes.

6 **Q** Are you giving opinions on behalf of the DEA?

7 **A** No.

8 **Q** You haven't been at DEA for seven years,  
9 approximately, correct?

10 **A** Correct.

11 **Q** There is nothing surprising to you about that  
12 language?

13 **A** No.

14 **Q** Is that the kind of boilerplate language you would  
15 expect to see?

16 MR. WEINBERGER: Objection, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Overruled.

18 **A** Yes.

19 **Q** Okay. Let's go on.

20 It says, this office on behalf of DEA affirmatively  
21 states DEA does not endorse your opinions, nor would you  
22 expect them to, and that the opinions --

23 THE COURT: The letter doesn't say that, so  
24 we're going to -- the jury is to disregard that comment.

25 **Q** All right. It goes on to say, "The opinions expressed

1 by Mr. Hill do not reflect the opinions by the Department,"  
2 that's the Department of Justice, "or DEA."

3 Do you see that?

4 **A** Yes.

5 **Q** Does that language surprise you?

6 **A** No.

7 **Q** Does that language in any way whatsoever suggest or  
8 indicate that your opinions are wrong?

9 MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

10 THE COURT: Sustained.

11 **Q** What do you believe that language means?

12 **A** This language means that I am not testifying on behalf  
13 of DEA.

14 **Q** Is that your complete understanding?

15 MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

16 THE COURT: He can testify to his  
17 understanding. It's overruled.

18 **A** Could you repeat the question, please?

19 **Q** Is that your complete understanding of what that  
20 means?

21 **A** Yes.

22 **Q** And are you certain of that understanding?

23 MR. WEINBERGER: Objection, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: I have to sustain that,  
25 Mr. Delinsky.

1                   MR. DELINSKY: Why? I've asked worse ones,  
2 Your Honor.

3   **Q**    Mr. Hill, do you know a gentleman named Louis Milione?

4   **A**    I know of him, yes.

5   **Q**    Who is Mr. Milione?

6   **A**    Currently, he is the deputy administrator of DEA.

7   **Q**    Today?

8   **A**    Yes.

9   **Q**    Let's go back to 2015. Who was Mr. Milione?

10   **A**    Mr. Milione replaced Mr. Rannazzisi as the head of  
11 Diversion.

12   **Q**    So Mr. Milione had Mr. Rannazzisi's position?

13   **A**    Yes.

14   **Q**    Okay. And then in between the 2015-2016 time frame,  
15 when Mr. Milione assumed that position, and today when he's  
16 in even a higher position at DEA, did Mr. Milione leave the  
17 DEA for a period of time?

18   **A**    Yes.

19   **Q**    Okay. And was he in private industry at that point in  
20 time?

21   **A**    Yes.

22   **Q**    Okay. I'd like to show you a similar *Touhy* letter  
23 that was written --

24                   MR. WEINBERGER: Objection to the -- before we  
25 get into describing it, can we see what you're --

1                   MR. DELINSKY: Well, I only have it on my  
2 phone. I can show my phone. I'm happy to.

3                   THE COURT: Well, let's go on the headphones  
4 here.

5                   (At side bar at 3:43 p.m.)

6                   MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, it has the same  
7 language.

8                   THE COURT: Well, it may have the same  
9 language. I allowed you to -- obviously I allowed you to  
10 ask the witness his understanding of a letter that was  
11 essentially sent to him, but this letter hasn't been sent to  
12 him.

13                  MR. DELINSKY: But, Your Honor, if plaintiffs  
14 are going to get up and say --

15                  THE COURT: Was this person Milione, was he  
16 called as an expert?

17                  MR. DELINSKY: He was, Your Honor. He was an  
18 expert retained on behalf of manufacturer defendants in  
19 Track One. He was a testifying expert in Track One.

20                  MR. WEINBERGER: But he never testified in  
21 Court.

22                  MR. DELINSKY: He testified in deposition.

23                  MR. WEINBERGER: So what?

24                  MR. DELINSKY: And the language is the exact  
25 same language, Your Honor. And this is someone who today is

1 the deputy administrator of the DEA.

2 THE COURT: Well, he hasn't received this  
3 letter and he's never seen it before.

4 MR. DELINSKY: Could I use it on redirect if  
5 Mr. Lanier attempts to suggest that the meaning of the  
6 letter is something different?

7 THE COURT: Well, depending on what he asks.  
8 I don't know. I haven't seen the letter.

9 MR. WEINBERGER: Neither have we.

10 THE COURT: But I'm not going to let you --  
11 showing some letter to someone else, he don't know the  
12 circumstances, so I think it's improper.

13 MR. DELINSKY: But Your Honor, it contains the  
14 exact same language.

15 THE COURT: It may, but he doesn't know what  
16 the circumstances are, and this witness doesn't know it.  
17 That's the point. He has no knowledge of Mr. Milione's  
18 circumstances.

19 I allowed him to testify about his understanding that  
20 the letter was essentially sent to him.

21 MR. DELINSKY: All right, Your Honor. Do I  
22 understand your ruling though, that depending on what  
23 happens on redirect, that that door may be opened? Because  
24 if this is unfairly characterized and suggested as something  
25 else that is -- that this language doesn't appear in other

1 letters for other people, including people who are current  
2 second-highest ranking --

3 THE COURT: Well, we'll see.

4 All right, Mr. Lanier, you're on notice that  
5 apparently a very similar letter was sent to Mr. Milione, so  
6 depending on what you ask and how you ask it, it might  
7 become relevant.

8 MR. LANIER: I understand, Your Honor. And if  
9 it does, then it will allow me to point out that this was  
10 Purdue's expert, and I don't think they'd agree with him  
11 either.

12 THE COURT: Right. So I don't know why you  
13 guys want to get into this, but I'm going to keep the  
14 boundaries fair on both sides.

15 (In open court at 3:46 p.m.)

16 BY MR. DELINSKY:

17 Q All right. Moving on, Mr. Hill. Let's go back just  
18 one set.

19 In your opinion, based on your experience at DEA, must  
20 there be an illegitimate prescription for corresponding  
21 responsibility to be violated?

22 MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

23 MR. LANIER: I withdraw his objection.

24 THE COURT: All right. I was going to  
25 overrule it anyway.

1           You may answer.

2           MR. WEINBERGER: Then I'm definitely  
3 withdrawing it, Your Honor.

4           MR. LANIER: I beat you to it, Judge.

5           THE COURT: You may answer it, sir.

6           Mr. Delinsky, if it's forgotten, you can ask it again.

7 BY MR. DELINSKY:

8       **Q**      Based on your experience at DEA over the course of 25  
9 years, for there to be a violation of corresponding  
10 responsibility, must the prescription be illegitimate to  
11 begin with?

12      **A**      Yes.

13      **Q**      Can a pharmacist violate corresponding responsibility  
14 if the underlying prescription is not illegitimate based on  
15 your experience?

16      **A**      No.

17      **Q**      Let's move on to a different opinion on corresponding  
18 responsibility, Mr. Hill.

19           Can corresponding responsibility be exercised through  
20 a line of data alone, in your experience?

21      **A**      Based on my experience, no.

22      **Q**      Based on your experience, must a pharmacist consider  
23 information beyond the drug information on the face of the  
24 prescription?

25      **A**      Yes, they must.

1       **Q**     Is it important for a pharmacist to consider human  
2     information, such as information the pharmacists can observe  
3     about the patient who has presented the pharmacist with the  
4     prescription?

5       **A**     Yes, they can consider that.

6       **Q**     Is it important for a pharmacist to consider on top of  
7     the prescription information in the prescription the  
8     pharmacist's knowledge of and own history with the patient?

9       **A**     Yes, that can be considered.

10      **Q**     Is it necessary for the pharmacist in exercising  
11     corresponding responsibility to consider her own  
12     observations of the patient?

13      **A**     Yes.

14      **Q**     Is it important on top of the drug information in the  
15     prescription or in the data for the pharmacist to consider  
16     the patient's medical condition?

17      **A**     Yes.

18      **Q**     Is it important in exercising corresponding  
19     responsibility for the pharmacist to consider her  
20     conversations and interactions with the patient?

21      **A**     Yes.

22      **Q**     Is it important in the exercise of corresponding  
23     responsibility for a pharmacist to consider her own  
24     knowledge and experience with the prescribing doctor?

25      **A**     Yes.

1       **Q**      Can any of this information be gleaned from data?

2       **A**      I would say no. It would be very rare.

3       **Q**      Can any of this information -- well, can most of this  
4                  information be gleaned from the face of the prescription  
5                  itself?

6       **A**      I would say no.

7       **Q**      Would it be fair to characterize this information as  
8                  the human information?

9       **A**      Yes.

10      **Q**      And is a critical part of corresponding  
11                  responsibility, in your experience, the consideration of the  
12                  human information?

13      **A**      Yes.

14      **Q**      Let's move on.

15                  Mr. Hill, are you familiar with the concept of  
16                  potential red flags?

17      **A**      Yes.

18      **Q**      Did DEA commence a formal process to brief pharmacists  
19                  on the concept of potential red flags?

20      **A**      Yes.

21      **Q**      When did those presentations begin?

22      **A**      The formal would have been the PDACs which started in  
23                  September of 2011.

24      **Q**      Now, that's not to say cases didn't come out before  
25                  then, correct?

1       **A**      Oh, that's correct.

2       **Q**      And they may identify some warnings signs, correct?

3       **A**      Yes, correct.

4       **Q**      But were the PDACs that commenced in September 2011  
5                  the first systematic and official approach to laying out  
6                  potential red flags for pharmacists?

7       **A**      Yes.

8       **Q**      I believe you testified you gave some of these  
9                  presentations.

10      **A**     Yes.

11      **Q**     Did Mr. Rannazzisi give some of these presentations?

12      **A**     Yes.

13      **Q**     Were your presentations similar to Mr. Rannazzisi's?

14      **A**     Yes.

15      **Q**     Mr. Hill, I'm showing you what's been marked as  
16                  P-15962. And as a matter of fact, it's not only marked, I  
17                  believe this is admitted. Okay?

18                  And again, the number is 15962.

19      **A**     Yes, I have it here.

20      **Q**     Do you recognize this document?

21      **A**     Yes.

22      **Q**     What is this document?

23      **A**     This is a document of a presentation that  
24                  Mr. Rannazzisi gave in May of 2015 at a PDAC that occurred  
25                  in Norfolk, Virginia.

1       **Q**     So is this one of those presentations that you were  
2 just talking about, one of those PDAC presentations?

3       **A**     Yes.

4       **Q**     Okay. Mr. Hill, if you could please turn to -- if you  
5 look at the very bottom of the page, there's a lot of  
6 numbers, but just go to 10, okay? The last two numbers.

7       **A**     Yes, I'm there.

8       **Q**     Okay. Now, on this page of Mr. Rannazzisi's slide, he  
9 lists potential red flags, correct?

10      **A**     Correct.

11      **Q**     Okay. Do potential red flags consider combinations of  
12 prescriptions or cocktails?

13      **A**     Yes.

14      **Q**     Do potential red flags include paying cash?

15      **A**     Yes.

16      **Q**     Do potential red flags include early refills?

17      **A**     Yes.

18      **Q**     Do potential red flags include individuals driving  
19 long distances to visit physicians?

20      **A**     Yes.

21      **Q**     And, by the way, was this a DEA presentation?

22      **A**     Yes.

23      **Q**     Okay. Let's go to the next page, Mr. Hill.

24                  Do more potential red flags include customers coming  
25 into the pharmacy in groups?

1       **A**     Yes.

2       **Q**     Does it include customers with prescriptions for  
3              controlled substances written by physicians not associated  
4              with pain management?

5       **A**     Yes.

6       **Q**     Okay. These are potential red flags; is that correct?

7       **A**     That's correct.

8       **Q**     Okay. Mr. Hill, could you explain to the ladies and  
9              gentlemen of the jury when a cash payment would only be a  
10             potential red flag and wouldn't rise to the level of an  
11             actual red flag?

12      **A**     Well, a cash payment could be a potential red flag,  
13           but you would have to look into it, and if you look at where  
14           it has -- prior to the Affordable Care Act, where it stated  
15           that in the United States you had approximately 50 million  
16           Americans that were uninsured or underinsured; so if you  
17           don't have insurance, the only way you can receive a  
18           prescription is by paying cash for it.

19      **Q**     So would that be an instance in which a prescription  
20           might be a potential -- a cash payment might not be  
21           suspicious at all, would only be a potential red flag?

22      **A**     That's correct.

23      **Q**     Wouldn't rise to an actual red flag?

24      **A**     That's correct.

25      **Q**     Okay. When would a prescription written by a doctor

1 who was 25 or 30 miles away only be a potential red flag?

2 **A** Well, it would depend on if the doctor is a specialty.  
3 So if you would take this area, for instance, if you have a  
4 person that lives far away but they may be going to the  
5 Cleveland Clinic for treatment or something, they may live a  
6 far distance, but that would be probably the best care for  
7 whatever ailment they have.

8 **Q** So that it wouldn't rise to the level of an actual red  
9 flag in that instance?

10 **A** No, it would not.

11 **Q** Okay. Who makes the judgment whether a potential red  
12 flag rises to the level of actual red flag?

13 **A** It would be the pharmacist that is working the counter  
14 when that prescription is presented to the pharmacist.

15 **Q** Is the deciding factor in determining whether a  
16 potential red flag rises to actual red flag typically  
17 information the pharmacist knows or learns about the patient  
18 at the pharmacy counter?

19 **A** That is correct.

20 **Q** If a pharmacist determines that a potential red flag  
21 is not an actual red flag, is there any actual red flag to  
22 resolve?

23 **A** No, there is not.

24 **Q** All right. Just a few more questions on flags.

25 **A** Okay.

1       **Q**     If a prescription contains a potential red flag, in  
2     your experience, does that mean the prescription's  
3     illegitimate?

4       **A**     No, it does not.

5       **Q**     If a prescription has an actual red flag, does that  
6     mean the prescription is necessarily illegitimate?

7       **A**     No, it does not.

8       **Q**     And finally, based on your experience, is it necessary  
9     for a pharmacy to have a written policy listing every  
10    conceivable red flag?

11      **A**     No, it is not.

12      **Q**     Mr. Hill, is it good practice for a pharmacist to  
13    document the resolution of an actual red flag?

14      **A**     It's good practice, but it's not required by the CSA  
15    or its implementing regulations.

16      **Q**     Is it good practice to document the resolution of a  
17    flag that's only a potential red flag and doesn't become an  
18    actual red flag?

19      **A**     I would say there would be no reason to document it if  
20    it's not an actual red flag and it's just a potential.

21      **Q**     Based on your experience, does the Controlled  
22    Substances Act require pharmacists to document the  
23    resolution of red flags?

24      **A**     No.

25      **Q**     Based on your experience, do DEA regulations require

1 pharmacists to document the resolution of red flags?

2 **A** No.

3 **Q** Do either the Controlled Substances Act or its  
4 regulations even discuss the documentation of red flags?

5 **A** No.

6 **Q** Do you know what the DEA Pharmacist's Manual is?

7 **A** Yes.

8 **Q** What is it?

9 **A** It's a manual that DEA publishes for pharmacies and  
10 pharmacists to give them like a baseline of what's accepted  
11 for a pharmacy practice and what they should be doing to  
12 stay compliant.

13 **Q** Are you familiar with the DEA Pharmacist's Manual?

14 **A** Yes.

15 **Q** Are you familiar with the 2010 version of the DEA  
16 Pharmacist's Manual?

17 **A** Yes.

18 **Q** Does the 2010 DEA Pharmacist's Manual direct  
19 pharmacists to document the resolution of red flags?

20 **A** No.

21 **Q** Is there a 2020 DEA Pharmacist's Manual?

22 **A** Yes.

23 **Q** Are you familiar with the 2020 DEA Pharmacist's  
24 Manual?

25 **A** Yes.

1       **Q**     Does the 2020 DEA Pharmacist's Manual direct  
2 pharmacists to document the resolution of red flags?

3       **A**     No.

4       **Q**     Do you know what DEA registrant letters are?

5       **A**     Yes.

6       **Q**     What are they?

7       **A**     Those were letters that Mr. Rannazzisi sent out to  
8 registrants, particularly distributors, that -- making them  
9 aware of the issue of the prescription drug abuse problem,  
10 as well as what were some of the things they were expected  
11 to be in compliance.

12      **Q**     Has DEA ever sent a Dear Registrant letter to pharmacy  
13 registrants directing pharmacists to document the resolution  
14 of red flags?

15      **A**     No.

16      **Q**     Based on your experience, if a pharmacist resolves a  
17 red flag but doesn't write down what she did, does this mean  
18 the pharmacist didn't do the work to resolve the red flag?

19      **A**     No.

20      **Q**     Based on your experience, if a pharmacist does not  
21 document the resolution of a red flag, is it fair to just  
22 assume that the pharmacist didn't resolve it?

23      **A**     No, it's not fair to just assume.

24      **Q**     Okay. All right. We're moving on from corresponding  
25 responsibility and red flags. I want to talk to you about

1 technology, Mr. Hill.

2 **A** Yes.

3 **Q** Based on your experience, does the Controlled  
4 Substances Act provide that pharmacists must operate data  
5 programs to review and block doctors?

6 **A** No.

7 **Q** Do any DEA regulations require doctor monitoring  
8 programs?

9 **A** No.

10 **Q** Has DEA ever provided official guidance to pharmacies  
11 indicating that they should have doctor monitoring programs?

12 **A** No.

13 **Q** Does the Controlled Substances Act, based on your  
14 experience, require pharmacies to implement red flag alerts  
15 in their computer systems?

16 **A** No.

17 **Q** Do any DEA regulations require the implementation of  
18 red flag computer alerts?

19 **A** No.

20 **Q** Has DEA ever provided official guidance to pharmacies  
21 indicating that they should implement red flag alerts in  
22 their computer systems?

23 **A** No.

24 **Q** Does the Controlled Substances Act provide that  
25 pharmacies must use algorithms to monitor their dispensing?

1      **A**      No.

2      **Q**      Does any DEA regulations require any of these kinds of  
3                algorithms?

4      **A**      No.

5      **Q**      Has DEA ever provided official guidance to pharmacies  
6                indicating that they should use algorithms to monitor  
7                dispensing?

8      **A**      No.

9      **Q**      Do you know Mr. Catizone?

10     **A**      Yes.

11     **Q**      Did you review Mr. Catizone's red flag methodology?

12     **A**      Yes.

13     **Q**      Do you have opinions on it?

14     **A**      Yes.

15     **Q**      In your opinion, is Mr. Catizone's methodology  
16                correct?

17     **A**      No.

18     **Q**      Let's discuss why, okay?

19     **A**      Okay.

20     **Q**      Does Mr. Catizone identify potential red flags or does  
21                he identify actual red flags?

22     **A**      Potential red flags.

23     **Q**      Do the potential red flags that Mr. Catizone  
24                identifies in his methodology necessarily require  
25                resolution?

1       **A**      No.

2       **Q**      Does Mr. Catizone also opine that documentation of the  
3                  resolution of red flags is required?

4       **A**      Yes.

5       **Q**      Is he correct?

6       **A**      No.

7       **Q**      Is documentation of the resolution of red flags  
8                  required by the United States Controlled Substances Act?

9       **A**      No.

10      **Q**      If the resolution of red flags are not documented,  
11                  does it mean they weren't resolved?

12      **A**      No, it does not.

13      **Q**      If corresponding responsibility -- is corresponding  
14                  responsibility, based on your experience, violated if a  
15                  pharmacist does not document her resolution of actual red  
16                  flags?

17      **A**      No, it is not.

18      **Q**      Final chapter, Mr. Hill.

19      **A**      Okay.

20      **Q**      And this chapter is about regulation and the  
21                  regulation of doctors and the regulation of pharmacies.

22      **A**      Okay.

23      **Q**      Are doctors and are pharmacies -- are doctors who  
24                  prescribe controlled substances regulated?

25      **A**      Yes.

1       **Q**     Are pharmacies who prescribe controlled substances  
2     regulated? I'm sorry. Bad, bad, bad.

3                  Are pharmacies that fill prescriptions for controlled  
4     substances regulated?

5       **A**     Yes.

6       **Q**     Must a doctor who prescribes controlled substances  
7     register with the DEA?

8       **A**     Yes.

9       **Q**     Can DEA suspend or revoke the registration of a doctor  
10    for improper prescribing?

11      **A**     Yes.

12      **Q**     Does DEA take that kind of action?

13      **A**     Yes.

14      **Q**     Can the United States bring civil and criminal actions  
15    against doctors for improper prescribing?

16      **A**     Yes.

17      **Q**     Does the United States take such actions?

18      **A**     Yes.

19      **Q**     Mr. Hill, are state medical boards charged with  
20    overseeing the practice of medicine in their respective  
21    states?

22      **A**     Yes.

23      **Q**     Must a doctor who prescribes controlled substances be  
24    licensed by their state medical board?

25      **A**     Yes.

1       **Q**      Can a state medical board suspend or revoke the  
2                    license of a doctor to prescribe controlled substances?

3       **A**      Yes.

4       **Q**      Does that happen?

5       **A**      Yes, it does.

6       **Q**      Pharmacies. Must a pharmacy be registered with DEA to  
7                    dispense controlled substances?

8       **A**      Yes.

9       **Q**      Must each individual pharmacy location be registered  
10                  itself?

11      **A**      Yes.

12      **Q**      So if a company operates a chain of pharmacies, does  
13                  each individual pharmacy require a DEA registration?

14      **A**      If they're going to dispense controlled substances,  
15                  yes.

16      **Q**      Can DEA suspend or revoke a pharmacy's registration  
17                  for improper dispensing?

18      **A**      Yes.

19      **Q**      Can the United States bring civil and criminal actions  
20                  against a pharmacy for improper dispensing?

21      **A**      Yes.

22      **Q**      Does DEA suspend and revoke licenses of pharmacies for  
23                  improper dispensing?

24      **A**      Yes.

25      **Q**      Does the United States bring civil and criminal

1 actions against pharmacies for improper dispensing?

2 **A** Yes.

3 **Q** Does DEA have at its disposal data to assist in  
4 identifying pharmacies that may be engaged in improper  
5 dispensing?

6 **A** Yes.

7 **Q** What's that data called?

8 **A** ARCOS.

9 **Q** And you've already provided some testimony about  
10 ARCOS, correct?

11 **A** Correct.

12 **Q** What information about a pharmacy does the ARCOS data  
13 show?

14 **A** It will show the pharmacy location that's ordering, it  
15 will show what product they're ordering, the quantity of the  
16 product they're ordering, and the date that it was ordered.

17 **Q** Does the ARCOS data show every Schedule II  
18 prescription opioid that a pharmacy handles?

19 **A** Yes.

20 **Q** And it shows it by particular drug code and drug  
21 class; is that correct?

22 **A** Yes.

23 **Q** Does it show it by date the pharmacy received the  
24 drug?

25 **A** Yes.

1 Q Does it show the quantity of the drug that the  
2 pharmacy is handling?

3 | A Yes.

4 | Q Does DEA analyze this data, based on your experience?

5 | A Yes.

6 Q Based on your experience, did DEA use this data to  
7 identify pharmacies for review?

8      **A**      Yes.

9 Q Is this the unit that you oversaw when you were  
10 section chief for the Pharmaceutical Investigation section?

11      **A**       Yes. At the time it was called the Targeting and  
12                  Analysis ARCOS Output Unit.

13 Q Okay. And lastly, can DEA go to pharmacies and  
14 inspect them in person?

15 | A Yes.

16 Q And does DEA do that when it sees reason to?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Do state boards of pharmacy oversee the practice of  
19 pharmacy in their respective states?

20 | A Yes.

21            Does this include the Ohio Board of Pharmacy?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Must a pharmacy be licensed by the State Board of  
24 Pharmacy to dispense controlled substances?

25 A Yes.

1       **Q**     Can a State Board of Pharmacy, like DEA, suspend or  
2     revoke a pharmacy's license?

3       **A**     Yes.

4       **Q**     Does that happen?

5       **A**     Yes.

6       **Q**     Does the Ohio Board of Pharmacy have data at its  
7     disposal on every controlled substance prescription that a  
8     pharmacy in Ohio fills?

9       **A**     Yes.

10      **Q**     What's that data called?

11      **A**     It's called the Ohio Automated Rx Reporting System,  
12     abbreviation OARRS.

13      **Q**     Can state boards of pharmacy use this data to identify  
14     pharmacies for review and possible investigation?

15      **A**     Yes.

16      **Q**     Can state boards of pharmacy inspect pharmacies?

17      **A**     Yes.

18      **Q**     Do they inspect pharmacies?

19      **A**     Yes.

20      **Q**     Does the Ohio Board of Pharmacy inspect pharmacies?

21      **A**     Yes.

22      **Q**     And is that another investigative tool at the disposal  
23     of the Ohio Board of Pharmacy?

24      **A**     Yes.

25      **Q**     Okay.

1                   MR. DELINSKY: Mr. Hill, thank you very much.

2                   I pass the witness.

3                   THE COURT: Okay. Any questions from  
4 Walgreens or Walmart?

5                   MR. STOFFELMAYR: No, Your Honor.

6                   MS. FUMERTON: No, Your Honor.

7                   THE COURT: Thank you.

8                   Then, Mr. Lanier, you're up.

9                   MR. LANIER: All right. Thank you, Judge.

10                  - - - - -

11                  CROSS-EXAMINATION

12                  BY MR. LANIER:

13                  **Q**        Mr. Hill?

14                  **A**        Yes, sir.

15                  **Q**        I did not get a chance to meet you outside. My name  
16                  is Mark Lanier. I'm going to be cross-examining you on  
17                  behalf of the folks of Lake and Trumbull Counties this  
18                  afternoon. Okay?

19                  **A**        Okay. Nice to meet you, sir.

20                  **Q**        It's a pleasure to meet you. And I'm remiss if I  
21                  don't say thank you for your service to the country, both  
22                  here and abroad, for the time you were working for the DEA.  
23                  I appreciate it.

24                  **A**        Thank you so much.

25                  **Q**        I've had a chance to check on you through Joe

1 Rannazzisi. He says you're a good man.

2 **A** Joe is a good man too.

3 **Q** I've got a road map for you because there are three  
4 areas I want to talk to you about, and here they are.

5 First of all, I did pretty good on your picture,  
6 didn't I?

7 **A** Yeah, you did.

8 **Q** I'm going to tell you, I've been sitting up there  
9 pretty close, that shirt/tie thing you've got going looks  
10 pretty good, at least to a boy from Texas like me, all  
11 right?

12 **A** Thank you, sir.

13 **Q** The jury gets tired of seeing me. I've got like two  
14 ties that I rotate, and I think that's about it. But you're  
15 looking good.

16 **A** Thank you, sir.

17 **Q** All right. We're going to talk about your time with  
18 the DEA. We're going to talk about your time at Amneal.

19 Am I saying that right?

20 **A** Yes, sir.

21 **Q** Amneal Pharmaceuticals. And then we're going to talk  
22 about your opioid consulting.

23 Okay?

24 **A** Yes, sir.

25 **Q** All right. Let's start, first stop, DEA.

1 Now, at the DEA you gave some speeches, right?

2 **A** That's correct, yes.

3 **Q** I think I've got as Plaintiffs' Demonstrative 128 --  
4 are you able to play it? I think I've got about a  
5 two-minute cut of one of your speeches, if His Honor will  
6 let me play it. It will make you famous here in court.

7 (Video still photo displayed.)

8 And you were looking good too there, man. You've got  
9 a good suit going.

10 MR. LANIER: Mr. Pitts, thank you, sir.

11 Time out.

12 **Q** Do you remember giving this speech?

13 **A** Yes. I believe that would have been at the Ravenwood  
14 Medical Center in Chardon, Ohio.

15 **Q** Okay. And to set this up, I think you're at kind of a  
16 Q&A point, or maybe it was just as you were doing the  
17 speech, people would interrupt you with questions. This is  
18 about an hour into the evening, and so I want to ask you a  
19 couple of questions about this, but first give the jury an  
20 idea of what you did.

21 (Video played.)

22 BY MR. LANIER:

23 **Q** Now, you gave that speech and you meant what you said,  
24 right?

25 **A** Yes.

1       **Q**       And you mean what you say when you say people  
2       shouldn't be on opioids longer than six months; that means  
3       you're an addict, right?

4       **A**       It means that they shouldn't be on it for long-term.  
5       If you notice, I also talked about it where I said six  
6       months and then I also talked about it being very long-term,  
7       yes.

8       **Q**       Yeah. And by the same token, you talked about how at  
9       the DEA y'all would joke about it being a cocktail. That's  
10      where you got more than one opiate and another drug working  
11      in tandem, right?

12      **A**       Well, yes, but what that was -- what I was talking  
13      about there is when you're talking about people that are  
14      abusing it with that.

15      **Q**       Well, you were talking about, I think, somebody who  
16      said, I got a hurt back, I want an OxyContin; that's a good  
17      thing. And if I really want a great thing, give me a  
18      cocktail, or something like that.

19      **A**       Yes, the abuse of it. Yes.

20      **Q**       Now, in addition to those kinds of speeches you gave,  
21      you also did work with Joe Rannazzisi, correct?

22      **A**       Correct.

23      **Q**       And that's the Joe Rannazzisi that was in here. He  
24      worked I think while you were with him, he was working  
25      ultimately in the Office of Diversion Control and was

1 running it, right?

2 **A** That's correct.

3 **Q** Now, you know in addition to those other things, he is  
4 also a pharmacist, right?

5 **A** Yes.

6 **Q** And I think also a lawyer, correct?

7 **A** Correct.

8 **Q** And found you to be a great fellow to work with, and  
9 you did a lot of good with him, didn't you?

10 **A** I hope that's the way America looked at it.

11 **Q** I think it did. I certainly did, based on everything.

12 Look, I cleaned it hard to look for things that I  
13 could stand up and say, hey, you messed up, all right? And  
14 you did a good job, and I want to thank you for that.

15 **A** Thank you.

16 **Q** That's sincere.

17 I want to ask you if you agree with some of the things  
18 that Joe Rannazzisi said in this case.

19 Let me do it this way. Let me just walk through some  
20 of your testimony first, and we'll maybe come back to Joe  
21 Rannazzisi.

22 You were the Pharmaceutical Investigation section  
23 chief, correct?

24 **A** Correct.

25 **Q** All right. And in that regard, you were there doing

1       that work for about four years?

2       **A**      Well, no, not actually four years. It would have been  
3           from January of 2009 till June 30 of 2012.

4       **Q**      Okay. I rounded up. Three years or so.

5       **A**      Yeah. I rounded down. Three and a half.

6       **Q**      All right. We'll meet in the middle. Four years.

7       No.

8                  But your testimony is that the epidemic in your mind  
9           started in 2011, and you premised that on a statement that  
10          was made by a Government agency. Fair?

11       **A**      Well, I would say that's not fair of actually what I  
12          said. What I said was in 2011, that's when the Government  
13          labeled it as an epidemic.

14       **Q**      Okay. Good. Because the epidemic started before  
15          that, didn't it?

16       **A**      Well, here's what I would say. Prior to the term  
17          "epidemic" being used, a lot of times the only term being  
18          used was "misuse" and "abuse" a lot.

19       **Q**      Or did you hear the word "crisis" being used?

20       **A**      Yeah, I think that was inadvertently used, like  
21          interchangeably, yes.

22       **Q**      Were you aware of the Congressional hearings about the  
23          opioid crisis back in 2002 and 2003?

24       **A**      I'm vaguely aware of it, but I don't recall everything  
25          that was said.

1       **Q**     Are you familiar with how the literature has talked  
2                   about the phases of the epidemic?

3       **A**     In 2002 and '3?

4       **Q**     No, at this point in time looking back, how they talk  
5                   about the different phases of the epidemic.

6       **A**     Yes, if you talk -- yes.

7       **Q**     And so we can see in scientific literature or the jury  
8                   has heard through testimony about different phases that go  
9                   back to the early 2000s. You're not fussing that we've had  
10                  a problem that long, are you?

11      **A**     Oh, no, I'm not fussing that at all.

12      **Q**     Okay. Good.

13                  Now, in that regard, as we stay with your time with  
14                  the DEA, you testified about 2011 also being the first time  
15                  period of red flags.

16                  Remember that?

17      **A**     Yes. Well, the term actually "red flag," yes.

18      **Q**     Did you know that the term was actually used before  
19                  that?

20      **A**     The term may have been used before that, but I'm  
21                  talking about when we officially set up a program and that  
22                  we were doing the training with the PDACs.

23      **Q**     Okay, good. So you know about the *East Main* case that  
24                  was decided, *East Main* out of Ohio, I believe, that was  
25                  decided back in -- written up in 2010 at least. Right?

1       **A**       I'm not sure what year, but if you have a copy for me  
2       to look at it, but I do know there was an *East Main* case,  
3       yes.

4       **Q**       All right. Either my daughter, Rachel, or our friend  
5       Ms. Fleming will bring that to you.

6                    MR. LANIER: Thank you, Maria.

7       **Q**       Do you have that in front of you, sir?

8       **A**       Yes, sir.

9       **Q**       And this is a publication out of the DOJ, Department  
10      of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration, Diversion  
11      Control Division.

12         You're very familiar with these, aren't you?

13       **A**       Yes.

14       **Q**       And you'll see here that this is a Registrant Action  
15      that went into the Federal Register October 27 of 2010.

16         Do you see that?

17       **A**       Yes, sir.

18       **Q**       And you'll see that it talks about on April 23, 2009,  
19      there was an order to show cause to this pharmacy in  
20      Columbus, Ohio.

21         Do you see where I'm looking?

22       **A**       Yes.

23       **Q**       And it says, the show cause order alleged that the  
24      respondent, owned by a fellow named Fletcher, from September  
25      2005 through February 2006 filled 6,619 controlled substance

1 prescriptions, including 4900 issued by a Dr. Paul Volkman.

2 Do you see that?

3 **A** Yes.

4 **Q** And then it talks about how February 10 of 2006 the  
5 DEA immediately suspended Volkman's registration.

6 You see that as well?

7 **A** Yes.

8 **Q** Now, if we continue to look at this, it will talk  
9 about how the folks directed his payments -- directed his  
10 patients to have his prescriptions filled at respondent, who  
11 filled them mostly in exchange for cash.

12 See that as a concern?

13 **A** Yes.

14 **Q** And you see it says, 98 percent of his patients filled  
15 didn't reside in the Columbus area.

16 You see that as well, right?

17 **A** Yes.

18 **Q** And now, in the process of this, if you'll look,  
19 you'll see on page 2, down in the footnotes, "Respondents'  
20 experience in dispensing controlled substances--the ALJ found  
21 respondent ignored numerous red flags when dispensing"  
22 these.

23 Do you see that, sir?

24 **A** Yes.

25 **Q** And among these listed is driving long distances,

1 receiving large volumes in the highest strength, not  
2 receiving individualized therapy; same for your cocktail;  
3 paying large amounts of cash, and getting multiple narcotic  
4 painkillers.

5 Do you see that, sir?

6 **A** Yes.

7 **Q** So isn't it safe to say, as the ALJ concluded, the  
8 respondent closed a blind eye to these obvious red flags?  
9 Isn't it fair to say that the DOJ was calling in the DEA,  
10 y'all were calling these red flags before 2011 certainly,  
11 right?

12 **A** They were being called red flags, but what I said  
13 occurred in 2011 was when we set up a formal program and  
14 structure of training to make the pharmacists aware of what  
15 the red flags were.

16 **Q** Well, but y'all had programs and training even before  
17 that while you were in Belize. Did you know about those?

18 **A** Yes. There were trainings that occurred, yes.

19 **Q** And whether we call them red flags or whether we call  
20 them issues, there were certainly presentations being done  
21 back in 2009, for example, that dealt with these issues,  
22 correct?

23 **A** Yes.

24 **Q** Now, 2009 was when you were serving the country in  
25 Belize; is that right?

1       **A**      That's incorrect in 2009.

2       **Q**      2009, where were you?

3       **A**      In 2009 I was the section chief of the Pharmaceutical  
4                  Investigation section.

5       **Q**      Ah. Okay. Well, then you would have known about  
6                  these pharmaceutical industry conferences like the one that  
7                  you see now in front of you that took place in Portland,  
8                  Oregon, October of 2009. Correct?

9       **A**      Yes.

10      **Q**      And you would have known that the trends being  
11                 identified in pharmaceutical diversion at the time included  
12                 doctor shopping, right?

13      **A**      Yes.

14      **Q**      Prescription fraud, correct?

15      **A**      Correct.

16      **Q**      Internet pharmacies, correct?

17      **A**      Correct.

18      **Q**      Florida pain clinics were already an item of interest  
19                 being talked about, true?

20      **A**      True.

21      **Q**      And in that, it talked about people paying primarily  
22                 cash, either for their doctor's visits or for their drugs,  
23                 right?

24      **A**      Correct.

25      **Q**      It talked about out-of-state patients coming from

1 Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Ohio, for 30 to  
2 \$40 a pill, correct?

3 **A** Correct.

4 **Q** And y'all told them indicators or probable cause  
5 factors of these problems, didn't you?

6 **A** Yes.

7 **Q** You talked about people using street slang, or large  
8 numbers of young patients with chronic pains, remember?

9 **A** Yes.

10 **Q** Talked about prescription intervals inconsistent with  
11 legitimate treatment, right?

12 **A** Yes.

13 **Q** And I could go on, but can we at least say that y'all  
14 were training pharmacies about these things back in 2009 at  
15 least, fair?

16 **A** Yes, we were training registrants. But what I said  
17 about the PDACs is when it was a formal training that was  
18 specifically for the pharmacies.

19 **Q** Well, sir, wasn't the one that we were just looking at  
20 one that was specifically a pharmaceutical industry  
21 conference just for the pharmacies?

22 **A** Well, no. If I'm not mistaken, that conference had  
23 registrants from all, you know, business models. It wasn't  
24 just geared towards pharmacy registrants.

25 **Q** Okay. I pulled it -- my team pulled it off the

1 Internet on the DEA Meetings and Industry Events under the  
2 flag of the Pharmaceutical Industry Conferences where they  
3 have the PDACs.

4 Do you see that, sir?

5 **A** I see that, but this is not -- this is not a PDAC.

6 **Q** It may be misplaced or misfiled by the DEA?

7 **A** A PDAC would say in the title Pharmacy Diversion  
8 Awareness Conference.

9 **Q** Okay. At least we can agree that there were other  
10 official efforts to educate on red flags, because the whole  
11 reason cases like *East Main* get published is so people will  
12 know what their obligations are, right?

13 **A** Well, there was education that was done, and it was  
14 making the registrants aware of the issues and concerns, but  
15 the term "red flag" was not used a lot at DEA. It was just  
16 like the presentation you saw where it said "issues and  
17 concerns."

18 **Q** Well, you dealt with a number of investigations. Did  
19 you do any of the investigations of CVS? The jury's heard  
20 about their settlements, the *Holiday* case, they've heard  
21 about Maryland, they've heard about Rhode Island, they've  
22 heard about Texas.

23 MR. DELINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. That  
24 goes straight to the *Touhy* regulation.

25 MR. LANIER: Not yet, Judge.

THE COURT: Overruled.

2 Q I can ask, did you do any work on those, without  
3 asking what you did.

4 Did you do any work on those, sir?

5 | A Yes.

6 Q Okay. All right. Let's move down the road. We're  
7 going to come back to some DEA opinions you've got, but  
8 we'll do that under your consulting, because you're not  
9 offering your opinions here today on behalf of the DEA.

10 | Fair?

11 A Fair.

12 Q All right. Amneal Pharmaceuticals. I don't have a  
13 lot there, but I do want to ask you a couple of things about  
14 it.

15           While you were at Amneal Pharmaceuticals, you were in  
16 charge of trying to help them comply with the law on  
17 controlled substances. True?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And then you left. What year did you leave?

20 **A** July 18, 2018.

21 Q And then it was the next year when Amneal got served  
22 with their subpoena from the Federal Government for their  
23 actions; is that right?

24 A I don't know when they were served.

25 Q You do know that a criminal investigation was launched

1 on them --

2 MR. DELINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Overruled.

4 **Q** -- concerning their marketing, sale, and distribution  
5 of controlled substances, right? At least oxymorphone?

6 **A** When I was at Amneal, Amneal was not manufacturing  
7 oxymorphone.

8 **Q** Okay. But they were doing other opiate drugs, right?

9 **A** Yes.

10 **Q** And then ultimately they did get investigated, but  
11 that -- I don't think it started until after you left. Am I  
12 correct, or did y'all know about it before you left?

13 **A** When I left Amneal, Amneal was not marketing  
14 oxymorphone, so anything dealing with oxymorphone would have  
15 occurred after I was gone.

16 **Q** But did you know about the Government's investigation  
17 while you were there, or did they only find out about that  
18 afterwards?

19 **A** I was not aware of any investigation dealing with  
20 oxymorphone, because when I was at Amneal, they didn't  
21 market oxymorphone.

22 **Q** All right. Were you aware of any other Government  
23 investigation going on to Amneal while you were there?

24 **A** There was an investigation that I believe was  
25 unfounded, where that came from a result of an inspection.

1       **Q**       All right. Let's move on from Amneal Pharmaceuticals  
2       and let's talk about your opioid consulting for just a bit,  
3       okay?

4       **A**       Yes, sir.

5       **Q**       First of all, you got hired as an expert in this case,  
6       true?

7       **A**       True.

8       **Q**       And, by the way, by my math, WIT, W-I-T, whoever they  
9       are -- I guess that stands for "witness" or something, I  
10      don't know, "witness service"?

11      **A**       I just know them as WIT Legal.

12      **Q**       Well, WIT Legal is ripping you off if they're getting  
13      275 bucks an hour of your money. Did you know -- we can  
14      talk about that later. But I'm just telling you, they're  
15      billing 700 bucks an hour for you, and you get what?

16      **A**       Well, first of all, I need to disagree with you with  
17      that comment, because I believe since I was the one that  
18      signed an agreement, obviously I feel whatever they're  
19      taking for what they're doing, I didn't have a problem with  
20      it. So for you to say that they're ripping me off, I kind  
21      of take issue with that, because I'm the one that's doing  
22      the work and I don't have a problem with it.

23      **Q**       That's fair, and I don't mean it in an offensive way  
24      at all. I meant it in a defensive way. I'm telling you  
25      that I'm trying to understand, they do no work in this case,

1 and they've made 200 and some-odd-thousand dollars off of  
2 the work you've done? Is that right?

3 **A** That's it approximately, yes.

4 **Q** I know that there's one other matter you work on, at  
5 least as of the time of your deposition. Is that also  
6 through them or is that an independent matter?

7 **A** Well, what do you -- what do you mean, like as far as  
8 the opioid litigation or --

9 **Q** No, no, no. Other than opioids, wasn't there another  
10 case in your deposition you told us you'd done a little bit  
11 of work on?

12 **A** Yes. I did some behind the scenes consulting.

13 **Q** Yeah. Was that independent or was that through them  
14 also?

15 **A** That was independent.

16 **Q** Fair enough.

17 All right. Now, I want to talk to you about your  
18 consulting opinions in this case. But you were shown by  
19 Mr. Delinsky Plaintiffs' Exhibit 23011, which is called a  
20 Touhy letter. Correct?

21 **A** Yes. Let me pull it back out too.

22 **Q** I've got an extra copy if you need it.

23 **A** No, I should have it here, sir.

24 **Q** Okay.

25 **A** Yes, I have it here in front of me, sir.

1       **Q**       Now, you wrote a report in this lawsuit, true?

2       **A**       True.

3       **Q**       And you served that report, or the counsel did, to us  
4       in this lawsuit, true?

5       **A**       Well, I don't know how it was served, but I know it  
6       was filed, yes.

7       **Q**       And you gave a deposition in this case as well,  
8       correct?

9       **A**       Correct.

10      **Q**       Now, you understand you're supposed to get DEA  
11       permission before you serve a report, correct?

12                  MR. DELINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.

13                  THE COURT: Overruled.

14      **A**       The counsel did notify the Department of Justice, yes.

15      **Q**       My question was, you understand before you issue a  
16       report, you're supposed to get DEA permission or DOJ, right?

17                  MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, headset, please?

18                  (At side bar at 4:38 p.m.)

19                  MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, there's law that  
20       says former employees of the Federal Government do not seek  
21       *Touhy* permission. We nevertheless as a practice in this  
22       case have been providing notice, but we explicitly disclaim  
23       when we do so that we don't think we have to. But this is  
24       an intricate legal issue. I believe there may be a Circuit  
25       slip on this.

1                   THE COURT: It's a fair question. He can say,  
2 I don't think I need to. Mr. Lanier can ask the question  
3 and the witness can answer it.

4                   MR. DELINSKY: I think he should lay the  
5 foundation to ask him first if he knows what the legal  
6 requirements and legal rules are.

7                   THE COURT: All right, Mr. Lanier, you can ask  
8 him, do you know if you -- were you required to get, you  
9 know, approval, and if he can say I was or I wasn't. I  
10 mean, that's a fair question to ask.

11                  MR. LANIER: Okay. Thank you.

12                  (In open court at 4:39 p.m.)

13 BY MR. LANIER:

14 **Q**       All right. So when you go about doing this, was it  
15 your understanding that you're supposed to get Government  
16 Touhy authorization before you issue a report?

17 **A**       The one thing I'm not sure what you're saying when you  
18 said "doing this," what were you referring to?

19 **Q**       Issuing an expert report in a case like this on these  
20 issues that touch what the kind of work you did.

21 **A**       Okay. Just wanted to make sure.

22 **Q**       No, no, no, no, no. And that's the right thing. You  
23 asked me if I'm unclear, I'll pester you if I think you're  
24 unclear.

25 **A**       Okay.

1       **Q**       That's a two-way street, all right?

2       **A**       Yes.

3       **Q**       So my question is, before you issued a report, was it  
4                  your understanding that you needed to in essence get  
5                  Government *Touhy* authorization?

6       **A**       My understanding was as long as the Department of  
7                  Justice is notified that a report is going to be done, that  
8                  was notification.

9       **Q**       If you'll look at this *Touhy* letter at the second  
10                 paragraph -- and by the way, this is from the Department of  
11                 Justice, the Northern District of Ohio. I guess this  
12                 courthouse.

13                  Do you see where it says, "The Department of Justice  
14                 and the DEA received your e-mail and letter containing the  
15                 expert report of Robert L. Hill, a former DEA employee, and  
16                 reviewed that report."

17                  Do you see that?

18       **A**       Yes.

19       **Q**       And this was sent to the law firm where Mr. Delinsky  
20                 works, true?

21       **A**       Yes.

22       **Q**       Then the Department of Justice goes on to say, "We  
23                 understand Mr. Hill's report was served before it was  
24                 provided to the DEA, and so this office and the DEA did not  
25                 have an opportunity to determine whether the information

1 contained in the report could be shared pursuant to," what's  
2 known as the "Touhy regulations." Right?

3 **A** Yes.

4 **Q** "Accordingly, Mr. Hill has not received authorization  
5 under" that "for this report or any future testimony."

6 Do you see that?

7 **A** Yes.

8 **Q** Now, have you in fact been given clearance from the  
9 Department of Justice since receiving this letter two months  
10 ago, three months ago now, have you received permission or  
11 authorization for your testimony?

12 **A** I know that the law firm has reached out to regarding  
13 my testimony today, yes.

14 **Q** Yes, you think you got permission?

15 **A** I know that the law firm had been contacted by the  
16 Department of Justice regarding my testimony today.

17 **Q** All right. So if the representation has been made by  
18 counsel on the record that there's not been any  
19 authorization granted yet, is that contrary to what you've  
20 been told?

21 **A** The information that I was provided was that when I  
22 testify today, someone would be here from the U.S.  
23 Attorney's Office in the audience.

24 **Q** So you were not told that not only is someone not here  
25 from the Department of Justice, they said they would not be

1 here, and they never gave you an okay to testify. None of  
2 that was conveyed to you before you testified?

3 MR. DELINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Overruled.

5 **A** No.

6 **Q** The letter continues, "Nevertheless, this office, on  
7 behalf of the DEA, affirmatively states that the DEA does  
8 not endorse any of the opinions contained in the report  
9 prepared by Mr. Hill, and that the opinions expressed by  
10 Mr. Hill do not reflect the opinions of the Department or  
11 the DEA."

12 Did I read that correctly?

13 **A** Yes, sir.

14 **Q** It says, "Further, the DEA does not attest to the  
15 accuracy of the facts, data, or opinions in Mr. Hill's  
16 report or future testimony."

17 Did I read that correctly?

18 **A** Yes.

19 **Q** And then there's a list of things that you are not  
20 authorized to provide, and that list is an A, B, C on page  
21 1, and it continues through page 2 down to letter M.

22 Do you see that, sir?

23 **A** Yes, sir.

24 **Q** And I think that counsel was relatively careful about  
25 asking you questions that would keep you outside of

1       violating those notes, and I'm going to try and do the same,  
2       but I still need to ask you about some of your testimony you  
3       have offered here today. Okay?

4       **A**      Okay.

5       **Q**      Now, you testified about corresponding responsibility  
6       to this jury. Remember that?

7       **A**      Yes.

8       **Q**      And you said, if I got it right, for there to be a  
9       violation of corresponding responsibility, the prescription  
10      must be illegitimate to begin with.

11                  Do you remember that?

12       **A**      Yes.

13       **Q**      Now, that is not the position of the DEA, true?

14       **A**      Well, I can tell you based on my 25 years at DEA, when  
15      I was at DEA you had to have an illegitimate prescription  
16      for there to be a violation of the corresponding  
17      responsibility.

18       **Q**      But an illegitimate prescription the way you and  
19      Mr. Delinsky were talking about it is a little bit different  
20      than what the DEA has said on this position, isn't it?

21       **A**      Can you tell me exactly where you're looking?

22       **Q**      Yes, sir. I've given you Plaintiffs' Exhibit 42147.  
23      It's the *Holiday* case against CVS. Issued an order on June  
24      8, 2012.

25                  Do you see that?

1      **A**      Yes.

2      **Q**      You know this, don't you?

3      **A**      I know the date, yes.

4      **Q**      Well, I mean you know this case, don't you?

5      **A**      I'm familiar with the case.

6      **Q**      This was a big deal, wasn't it?

7      **A**      I'm familiar with the case, yes.

8      **Q**      If you will turn to the page that in the top  
9                  right-hand corner says 62341, I'd like to walk through a few  
10          things that are in this case and see if they are consistent  
11          or inconsistent with what you claim the DEA position to be.  
12          All right?

13     **A**      Yes. I'm turning to the page.

14     **Q**      All right. Tell me when you get there, and I'll try  
15          and direct you where I am on the page.

16     **A**      Sir, I'm here.

17     **Q**      All right. It's got three columns, right?

18     **A**      Yes.

19     **Q**      I'm going to go to the bottom left of the first  
20          column, down toward the bottom at the start of that  
21          paragraph. I'll zoom it in, okay?

22     **A**      Yes.

23     **Q**      This says the "DEA has interpreted the legitimate  
24          medical purpose feature of the corresponding responsibility  
25          duty."

1           Do you see where I'm reading?

2   **A**    Yes.

3   **Q**    And the DEA has interpreted it "as prohibiting a  
4       pharmacist from filling a prescription for a controlled  
5       substance when he or she either knows or has reason to know  
6       that the prescription was not written for a legitimate  
7       medical purpose."

8           Do you see that?

9   **A**    Yes.

10   **Q**    Do you agree that that was the DEA position?

11   **A**    Well, yes, because they're saying it has to be an  
12       illegitimate prescription, not for a legitimate medical  
13       purpose.

14   **Q**    And we'll get to what that means in just a moment.

15           "When prescriptions are clearly not issued for a  
16       legitimate medical purpose, a pharmacist may not  
17       intentionally close her or his eyes and thereby avoid actual  
18       knowledge of the real purpose of the prescription."

19           Do you see that, sir?

20   **A**    Yes, I do.

21   **Q**    And you agree with that as well, don't you?

22   **A**    I agree with that, but that's not everything that it  
23       covered in this ruling.

24   **Q**    I know. We're going to get to more.

25           Look at the next. It says, "Accordingly, a pharmacist

1 or pharmacy may not dispense a prescription in the face of a  
2 red flag."

3 Do you see where I'm reading?

4 **A** Yes.

5 **Q** And then it defines red flag. It says it's a  
6 "circumstance that does or should raise a reasonable  
7 suspicion as to the validity of a prescription."

8 You see where I'm reading?

9 **A** Yes.

10 **Q** And so with that definition of red flag, it says,  
11 "accordingly, a pharmacist or pharmacy may not dispense a  
12 prescription in the face of a red flag unless she or he or  
13 it," because it is the pharmacy itself, right, not the  
14 pharmacist, right?

15 **A** It could potentially be "it" could be the pharmacy,  
16 yes.

17 **Q** Well, yeah, this started out "a pharmacist or a  
18 pharmacy."

19 **A** Yes.

20 **Q** So "unless he or it takes steps to resolve the red  
21 flag and ensure that the prescription is valid."

22 Do you see that?

23 **A** Yes.

24 **Q** So corresponding responsibility means, don't  
25 dispense -- you may not dispense a prescription in the face

1 of a red flag, something that raises a reasonable suspicion,  
2 until you've taken the steps to resolve it and ensure that  
3 the prescription is valid. True?

4 **A** That's what it says, yes.

5 **Q** And it goes on to say, "It follows that to show a  
6 violation of the corresponding responsibility, the  
7 Government must establish, one, the respondent dispensed a  
8 controlled substance."

9 Do you agree?

10 **A** Yes.

11 **Q** "Two, a red flag was or should have been recognized at  
12 or before the time the controlled substance was dispensed."  
13 True?

14 **A** True.

15 **Q** "And, three, the question created by the red flag was  
16 not resolved conclusively prior to the dispensing of the  
17 controlled substance."

18 Do you see that?

19 **A** Yes.

20 **Q** So violating corresponding responsibility, according  
21 to the DEA, is a three-step process, fair?

22 MR. DELINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This is  
23 an ALJ ruling, not the DEA.

24 THE COURT: Overruled. You can ask the  
25 question.

1 | A Fair.

2 Q And then it references the *Sun & Lake Pharmacy* case,  
3 where it says that it was found there that the "pharmacy  
4 violated the corresponding responsibility where it took no  
5 steps to resolve red flags prior to dispensing controlled  
6 substances."

7 Do you see that, sir?

8 | A Yes.

9           **Q**       And so the idea that a red flag doesn't have -- that  
10      corresponding responsibility is only limited to whether or  
11      not the prescription's valid, you've got corresponding  
12      responsibility issues simply from how you handle red flags,  
13      true?

14      **A**       You can have corresponding responsibility issues if  
15      you don't have -- address the red flags.

16 Q Okay. And this is -- the red flags in this case, do  
17 you recall what they were?

18      **A**      In the Sanford case?

19 Q Yes, sir. If you'll look at 62318. I wasn't trying  
20 to do a memory quiz on you.

21      **A**           Yes, okay.

22 Q That's not fair for any of us, especially --

23 MR. DELINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.

24 Q -- as we get older.

THE COURT: All right.

1       **Q**      I've got to look at it, is what I'm telling you.

2                  The "Professor Doering, who was an expert witness,  
3 identified such red flags as the patient paying for  
4 controlled substance prescriptions with cash."

5                  Do you see that?

6       **A**      Yes.

7       **Q**      "A prescriber writes for certain combinations or  
8 patterns of drugs."

9                  You see that?

10      **A**      Yes.

11      **Q**      "Multiple patients presenting prescriptions for the  
12 same drugs in the same quantities."

13                  You see that as well?

14      **A**      Yes.

15      **Q**      And there are more and more that the jury's heard  
16 about throughout the process of this. But can we suffice it  
17 to say that the instructions of the DEA are that if you  
18 identify -- first you have an obligation to identify red  
19 flags, true?

20      **A**      I would say "obligation" is maybe a word that I  
21 wouldn't use, but if red flags are present, you have to  
22 address them.

23      **Q**      Well, let's look on page 21 to see what the  
24 administrative law judge said about the statements of  
25 respondent's employees.

1           "That they manifested a complete abdication of their  
2 responsibility to exercise professional judgment before  
3 dispensing prescriptions for highly abused controlled  
4 substances."

5           Do you see that?

6   **A**   Yes.

7   **Q**   And it talked about them "dispensing numerous  
8 prescriptions when their pharmacists either knew or had  
9 reason to know the prescriptions lacked a legitimate medical  
10 purpose."

11          Do you see that as well?

12   **A**   Yes.

13   **Q**   And, by the way, this is why it's the obligation of  
14 the company to give the right tools to their pharmacists to  
15 be able to do this on a day-to-day basis. True?

16   **A**   I would -- when you say it's an obligation, I look at  
17 it more based on my experience that corresponding  
18 responsibility is invoked and the judgment is based on the  
19 pharmacist that is sitting there at the counter.

20          So when you say it's an obligation for the companies  
21 to give them the tools, they can have tools, but you have to  
22 use your professional judgment and look at the totality of  
23 the circumstances of that prescription to invoke your  
24 corresponding responsibility.

25   **Q**   I agree, you've got both. You've got to have tools

1 and you've got to have a pharmacist who's willing to use  
2 them, right?

3 **A** Yes.

4 **Q** All right. And the responsibility for tools I was  
5 taking from the CVS comments on page 62323, where the  
6 official for CVS testified that "CVS takes its  
7 responsibility seriously."

8           And in that regard they said, "We understand it's our  
9 responsibility to provide our stores the tools and  
10 information that they need to do their jobs on a day-to-day  
11 basis and in compliance with state, federal, and local  
12 legislation and requirements."

13           They're talking about some actions they've taken that  
14 they think help them do that.

15           Do you see that?

16 **A** Yes.

17 **Q** And so in that regard, would you agree with me you not  
18 only have to have a pharmacist who's doing their  
19 responsibility, but if they're working for a chain pharmacy  
20 or another -- an individual pharmacy, they're supposed to be  
21 provided the tools to do the work, right?

22 **A** Well, having tools would be helpful, yes.

23 **Q** I mean, for example, you need a computer if you're  
24 going to run an OARRS check, right?

25 **A** That would be helpful, but in today's day and age,

1 people also have, you know, a computer in their hand. So,  
2 but, yes, having a computer would be helpful.

3 **Q** Right. And you're aware, maybe you're not aware, are  
4 you aware that there's at least for a good period of time  
5 where the defendants would not allow their --

6 MR. DELINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.

7 Objection.

8 THE COURT: Yeah, sustained.

9 **Q** Are you aware of any policies by any of the defendants  
10 that their pharmacists were not allowed to use their  
11 personal devices at work?

12 MR. DELINSKY: Objection to the use of the  
13 word "defendants," Your Honor.

14 **Q** By any of the defendants, any of the three?

15 THE COURT: Overruled.

16 **A** I am not familiar with or recall seeing any policies  
17 like that.

18 **Q** Fair enough.

19 All right. Let's talk about the number of good  
20 doctors. Most doctors are trying to do the right thing and  
21 they're really good, right?

22 **A** Yes.

23 **Q** And I don't know if you go 99 percent, 99.5 percent,  
24 99.9 percent. I'll say almost every one. But that doesn't  
25 change the fact, and you and I both know, that there are

1 some doctors out there who are rascals, true?

2 **A** I would say there are doctors out there that are not  
3 doing what they're supposed to do as doctors.

4 **Q** And that's one reason it's so important that the  
5 pharmacists do their job appropriately, fair?

6 **A** Well, there's several reasons why the pharmacists  
7 should do their job appropriately, but a pharmacist should  
8 use their corresponding responsibility to determine if a  
9 prescription was issued for a valid legitimate purpose.

10 **Q** Right, because the pharmacists and the pharmacy,  
11 that's the last line of defense before these drugs leave the  
12 closed system, true?

13 **A** False.

14 **Q** Okay. So if the DEA puts that in their presentations,  
15 that the pharmacist is the last line of defense, you would  
16 disagree with that?

17 **A** I would disagree with that if the pharmacist is not  
18 the one dispensing the controlled substance. If a  
19 practitioner is dispensing that controlled substance, they  
20 are the last line of defense. If a pharmacist is dispensing  
21 it, then, yes, they are the last line of defense.

22 **Q** I agree with you. Thank you for correcting that.

23 When the pharmacist is dispensing the drug, in that  
24 event the pharmacist is the last line of defense. Can we  
25 agree on that?

1       **A**     We can agree.

2       **Q**     Great. Thank you, sir.

3                 Now, the last thing I want to talk to you about is the  
4 need to document.

5                 First of all, would you agree that companies need to  
6 abide by their own internal policies?

7       **A**     A company internal policy does not trump what the CSA  
8 or the Federal Regs. So even though a company may say that,  
9 yes, you should do this, it's not a legal obligation.

10      **Q**     Well, now you're talking about Federal Regulations.  
11                 What about state regulations?

12      **A**     Well, a pharmacy, first of all, they're registered in  
13 their state, so they have to be compliant with whatever  
14 state regulations they have to be compliant in that  
15 state. And so that has to hold that federal registration.

16      **Q**     And are you familiar with the requirement that  
17 pharmacies do best practices, what some call it different  
18 words, but it's basically standard operating procedures,  
19 best practices, whatever it may be.

20                 You're familiar with that, right?

21      **A**     I'm familiar with the term "best practices," but it  
22 doesn't mean that I agree with what all of them may say  
23 "this is best practices."

24      **Q**     Okay. But when you're testifying about that, you're  
25 not testifying about it as a pharmacist, fair?

1 | A Fair.

You're not testifying about it as a lawyer, fair?

3 | A Fair.

4 Q And you're not testifying about it as a specialist in  
5 state boards of pharmacy and what they require, as opposed  
6 to the DEA, fair?

7 | A Fair.

8 Q Okay.

9 MR. LANIER: Your Honor, I think that's it.

10 I've come to the end of the road.

11 Sir, thank you again very much. It was a pleasure. I  
12 may get a chance to recross you, but if I don't, then I wish  
13 you the very best.

14 THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir. And have a good  
15 weekend.

16 MR. LANIER: You too, sir.

17 THE COURT: I'd like to go on the headphones  
18 for a second, please.

19 | (At side bar at 5:02 p.m.)

20 THE COURT: I'm reluctant to keep the jury  
21 real late on Friday. My guess is they're going to have a  
22 number of questions, and then I would think that both sides  
23 would have some. And on the other hand, I hate to have this  
24 out-of-town witness stay over the weekend or come back.

25 But I'm thinking -- what I'm suggesting is I'll ask

1       the jury if they have questions now while it's fresh in  
2       their mind, they'll present them, and then we'll come back  
3       Monday morning and conclude with this witness.

4                    MR. LANIER: Whatever you think, Judge.

5                    MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, I think that's  
6        fine. Should we see how many question there are? Because  
7        it could be that this could be done fast.

8                    THE COURT: All right. That's a fair request,  
9        Mr. Delinsky. Let's how many questions we've got. Again, I  
10      don't know how many that you have of your own.

11                  MR. DELINSKY: Not many.

12                  THE COURT: All right. All right.

13                  (In open court at 5:03 p.m.)

14                  THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, if anyone  
15      has any questions of this witness, I want to see how many  
16      we've got to figure out the timing.

17                  So if you want to give them to Mr. Pitts, please.

18                  (Laughter in courtroom.)

19                  That looks like the smallest question on the tiniest  
20      piece of paper. We need a magnifying glass for that one.  
21      Okay. Well, that won't take long to review that tiny  
22      question. It may be a long question on a tiny piece of  
23      paper.

24                  (Juror question review.)

25                  THE COURT: I think we'll go forward then.

1 Okay.

2 - - - - -

3 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

4 BY MR. DELINSKY:

5 **Q** All right. We're going to try to go real fast.

6 **A** Yes, sir.

7 **Q** Most importantly, so the jury can go home, but also so  
8 that you can get home to Virginia and see your wife tonight,  
9 okay?

10 **A** Yes, sir.

11 **Q** All right. I'm showing you, Mr. Hill, a question that  
12 has been put to you by the jury. "Does CVS require their  
13 pharmacists to document the resolution of red flags?" As a  
14 matter of policy.

15 **A** From the documents that I reviewed, yes.

16 **Q** Okay. And let's just follow up on that.

17 You are absolutely right, CVS requires documentation,  
18 correct?

19 **A** Correct.

20 **Q** Is what a policy requires different from what a law  
21 requires?

22 **A** Yes.

23 **Q** Okay. Mr. Hill, are prescription opioids FDA  
24 approved?

25 **A** Yes.

1 Q In your opinion, should they be available for  
2 patients?

3 | **A** Yes.

## 4 | Q Why?

5      **A**        Because they have therapeutic value to treat certain  
6                    ailments.

7           **Q**       Is it your opinion that prescription opioids should be  
8 prescribed, dispensed, and used as they are supposed to be?

9      **A**      Yes.

10 Q Okay. Now, we've talked about it. You do not like  
11 the prescribing of prescription opioids for long-term  
12 chronic pain, correct?

13      **A**      Correct.

14 Q But you understand doctors do it, correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And do you understand that doctors prescribe  
17 prescription opioids for long-term chronic pain in good  
18 faith to try to help their patients?

19 A Yes.

20 MR. WEINBERGER: Objection, Your Honor.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.

22 THE COURT: Yeah, I'm going to sustain that.

23 Q Mr. Hill, are you aware --

24 THE COURT: The jury is to disregard the  
25 answer.

1       **Q**     If a doctor, Mr. Hill, treats a patient with long-term  
2     prescription opioid therapy for chronic pain --

3       **A**     I didn't hear the last part. I'm sorry.

4       **Q**     If a doctor treats a patient with long-term opioid  
5     therapy for chronic pain and does so in good faith for  
6     legitimate medical reasons, does that violate the Controlled  
7     Substances Act?

8       **A**     No.

9       **Q**     Are you aware that the CDC, the United States CDC,  
10    issued guidelines in 2016?

11                  MR. WEINBERGER: Objection, Your Honor. This  
12    is beyond the scope of --

13                  MR. DELINSKY: No, it's squarely within the  
14    scope, Your Honor.

15                  THE COURT: I'll allow the question.

16       **Q**     And let me be more specific.

17                  Are you aware that in 2016 the Center for Disease  
18    Control issued guidelines for the prescribing of opioids for  
19    chronic pain?

20       **A**     I vaguely remember they had put something out about  
21    it, yes.

22       **Q**     Okay. Do you recall that that was the first time,  
23    this being in 2016, that the Government had put out  
24    prescribing guidelines for chronic pain?

25                  MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

1                   THE COURT: Yeah, I'm going to sustain that.

2                   MR. DELINSKY: Okay.

3       **Q**       Mr. Hill, is it appropriate for a pharmacist to fill  
4 prescriptions for chronic pain when a patient is on  
5 long-term chronic pain therapy when a doctor writes them in  
6 good faith and for legitimate medical reasons?

7                   MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

8                   THE COURT: Sustained.

9       **Q**       Based on your experience, is it your opinion -- in  
10 your opinion, is it appropriate for a pharmacist to fill a  
11 prescription for prescription opioids to treat long-term  
12 chronic pain if the prescription was written for a  
13 legitimate medical reason?

14                  MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

15                  THE COURT: Mr. Delinsky --

16                  MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, everybody wants to  
17 go home. I'll just move on.

18                  THE COURT: Okay.

19       **Q**       All right. Let's quickly go to this *Touhy* issue that  
20 I'm sure the jury's never heard of before about your  
21 authorization to testify or not.

22                  Do you remember that?

23       **A**       Yes, sir.

24       **Q**       Mr. Hill, do you have any idea what the *Touhy* rules  
25 are in detail?

1       **A**       Not really. I just know it's that -- by me being a  
2 former Government employee, that I have to have  
3 authorization. And even if they don't give me authorization  
4 and I testify or write a report, there's certain areas that  
5 I can't touch on.

6       **Q**       Are you aware that there's cases that say former  
7 Government employees like yourself don't have to obtain it?

8                   MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

9                   THE COURT: Overruled.

10      **A**       I'm not aware. I don't know.

11      **Q**       Do you know how many communications my office has had  
12 with the Department of Justice regarding your testimony?

13                   MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

14                   THE COURT: Sustained.

15                   MR. DELINSKY: Why? I'm just asking.

16                   MR. WEINBERGER: I'm just objecting.

17                   THE COURT: I'll allow the question. If he  
18 knows.

19      **A**       I don't know.

20      **Q**       Okay. Do you know what the substance of those  
21 communications --

22                   THE COURT: That --

23                   MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

24                   THE COURT: All right, I'll allow the  
25 question, do you know the substance.

1       **A**     No, I do not.

2       **Q**     But you do know that there have been communications  
3               regarding your opinions with the Department of Justice going  
4               back a few years, correct?

5       **A**     Correct.

6       **Q**     Okay. Last questions.

7               Is it appropriate for a pharmacist to fill a  
8               prescription written for a legitimate medical reason?

9       **A**     You're tailing off. I didn't hear the last part.

10      **Q**     I'm sorry, Mr. Hill.

11               Is it appropriate for a pharmacist to fill a  
12               prescription that was written for a legitimate medical  
13               reason?

14      **A**     Yes, it's appropriate.

15      **Q**     If a legitimate prescription is filled that was  
16               written for a legitimate medical reason, is there diversion?

17               MR. WEINBERGER: Objection.

18               THE COURT: Yeah, it's sustained.

19      **Q**     What is the Section of the Code of Federal Regulations  
20               that discusses corresponding responsibility?

21      **A**     1306.04.

22      **Q**     Does 1306.04 state that legitimate or illegitimate  
23               prescriptions can't be filled?

24      **A**     No.

25      **Q**     Well, which --

1       **A**       It states that illegitimate prescriptions should not  
2       be filled.

3                    MR. DELINSKY: Okay. I have nothing further,  
4       Your Honor.

5                    THE COURT: All right. I assume no other  
6       questions from Walgreens or Walmart?

7                    MR. STOFFELMAYR: Correct. Thank you, Judge.

8                    THE COURT: Thank you.

9                    MR. LANIER: Judge, I have a birthday party to  
10      get to.

11                  THE COURT: Is it the juror's?

12                  MR. LANIER: I'm --

13                  THE COURT: No, I can't let you go.

14                  MR. LANIER: I was not invited.

15                  THE COURT: All right. Even if you were, I  
16      couldn't allow you to attend.

17                  Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Hill. You are  
18      excused. Safe travels.

19                  THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

20                  THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen,  
21      we're going to break for the evening. Again, because it's a  
22      weekend, I'm reminding you again of the admonitions. Do not  
23      read, listen, encounter anything whatsoever in the media  
24      about this case or anything close to it. Do not discuss  
25      this case with anyone.

I want to tell you what -- the schedule for next week,  
I anticipate that testimony is going to conclude the middle  
of the week. As you know, Thursday, next Thursday, is  
Veterans Day. It's a very important federal holiday. The  
courthouse is closed.

When I was a trial lawyer many years ago and I had long cases, I appreciated the opportunity to prepare, have some time to prepare my closing arguments so it could be succinct; I could say the things I wanted to say and leave out the things I didn't need to leave out, and I want to give the lawyers the time to do that.

12 So we're not going to have court next Friday, the  
13 12th, so you'll be off Thursday and Friday. I know no one's  
14 going to be violently upset to have the day off.

15           And it's my intention, then, on Monday the 15th at 9  
16       a.m. we will have closing arguments and the final  
17       instructions, and the case will be submitted to you for your  
18       deliberations.

19 So have a good weekend, and we'll see you at 9 a.m.  
20 where we'll have, Monday, the next defense witness.

21 (Jury excused for the day at 5:14 p.m.)

22 THE COURT: Okay. Everyone be seated just for  
23 a second. If you could just close the back door, please.

24 MR. DELINSKY: Your Honor, before we go  
25 further, I'd just like to apologize for raising my voice.

1       It's the public defender in me, and sometimes I get very  
2       excited about important issues.

3                     THE COURT: It's a little bit -- the tone was  
4       a little bit harsh, Mr. Delinsky, and some judges would have  
5       come down on you hard, but I understood you were passionate,  
6       so --

7                     MR. DELINSKY: They have at times and you've  
8       been patient, and it's not the first time in this trial. I  
9       appreciate the Judge's indulgence of it. It's --

10                  THE COURT: Okay.

11                  MR. DELINSKY: Passionate's the right word,  
12       but sometimes it can go a little too much.

13                  THE COURT: That was a little bit excessive.

14                  MR. WEINBERGER: I thought you were yelling at  
15       us, not at the Judge.

16                  THE COURT: It was a little excessive, but  
17       that's okay.

18                  All right. It's sort of late. Let's -- first thing  
19       Monday we'll take up exhibits. We have -- so I'd like  
20       counsel, over the weekend I'd like to stay current.

21                  We have Murphy, Dr. Murphy. The plaintiffs are  
22       offering two. I don't know what the defendants have.

23                  MS. FUMERTON: Your Honor, we'll work with  
24       counsel over the weekend to --

25                  THE COURT: We've got Dr. Murphy, Dr.

1 Glickman, and Mr. Hill. So if we could over the weekend  
2 work those out, and I'll take those up Monday morning.

3 And then so Monday we'll have -- there are a couple  
4 depositions, there were some pharmacists, and possibly  
5 another expert, or not? I'm trying to remember who the  
6 defendants said they were --

7 MR. STOFFELMAYR: That's correct, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Okay. And then -- okay.

9 MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, the defendants  
10 filed an objection to your jury instruction.

11 THE COURT: There were two filings.

12 MR. WEINBERGER: I didn't see both of them.

13 THE COURT: One came in earlier, one came  
14 in --

15 MR. WEINBERGER: Okay. If we can -- I think  
16 the deadline you set was for us to respond on Monday.

17 THE COURT: Yes, it was Monday.

18 MR. WEINBERGER: And so can we say by the end  
19 of the day Monday; we'll try and get it in earlier?

20 THE COURT: We're going to start looking at  
21 them, but, yeah, by the end of the day Monday, because I  
22 want to obviously before we break everyone needs to know  
23 what the instructions are going to be. So I'm considering  
24 what everyone says carefully.

25 MR. WEINBERGER: And can we just confirm with

1       the defendants, which videos do you intend to play? And I  
2       think we've got the names of the two of the three  
3       pharmacists.

4                   MS. FUMERTON: We'll be making our disclosure  
5       tonight as we're required. I think there's one other one.  
6       So it's Debbie Mack and Ashley, and just one other  
7       deposition, but we're filing the list. You'll get it  
8       shortly.

9                   MR. DELINSKY: And, Pete, I can talk to you.  
10      I can supply the missing pharmacist's name after court.

11      MR. WEINBERGER: Okay. All right.

12      THE COURT: So my time computations today were  
13      4.25 for the defendants and 1.75 for plaintiffs.

14      Okay. Have a good weekend everyone.

15                   (Proceedings adjourned at 5:18 p.m.)

16                   \* \* \* \* \*

17                   **C E R T I F I C A T E**

18

19      I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript  
20      of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter  
21      prepared from my stenotype notes.

22

23      /s/ Lance A. Boardman                   11-05-2021  
24      Lance A. Boardman, RDR, CRR                   DATE

25